

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XIV

MARCH, 1943

No. 3

The Social Ethic of Martin Luther

(This study, so vitally connected with current thought trends, was presented to the Pastoral Conference of Greater Los Angeles and recommended by vote of that body for publication in the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY. It is herewith submitted in a shorter form prepared by the author.)

Introduction

In the present effort to trace the fierce currents of Europe's political ground swells to their source, many writers wish to discover the first rising of the tide in the thought channels of Martin Luther's ideas on religion, politics, and social problems, away back in the sixteenth century. Able thinkers, like McGovern, who have sent their searching gaze into the dim years of history in the hope of discovering the precursors, either men or ideologies, of the present world-wide eruption, have held to a theory of history in which men like Luther are given a lion's share in the responsibility of starting thought processes which now at last have broken through the floodgates to overwhelm the entire world. The very title of McGovern's book *From Luther to Hitler* holds the implication of an intimate relationship between Martin Luther, the sixteenth century prophet of a new day, and Adolf Hitler, the twentieth-century high priest of a new order. The political philosophy of Martin Luther is summarized thus:

Luther started with a plea for reform in the concept of the church and ended with a reform in the concept of the state. He started with a plea for individual liberty and for freedom of conscience; yet his doctrines led directly to a belief in the divine right of kings and to the belief that monarchs have a right to dictate religious dogmas to the private individual. He started as an internationalist with a message to the peoples of all nations; he ended by formulating the doctrine of all-powerful national states in perpetual antagonism to one another. He started with the doctrine of the basic equality of all men, and ended with the doctrine that all men should be subject to the iron will of their secular lord.¹⁾

1) William Montgomery McGovern, *From Luther to Hitler* (Cambridge, The Riverside Press: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1941), p. 31.

Although an attempt may have been made to state the case fairly and justly, as a historian should, there is a very conspicuous lack of acquaintance with the sources of this period. McGovern is only one of many interpreters of the sixteenth century Reformation who have fallen into the snare of blandly accepting the popular view which makes Luther a fervid nationalist, whose primary interest it was to liberate his countrymen from the yoke of foreign enslavement. Thus Peter Viereck in his *Metapolitics* falls in line with the accepted order of the day when, for example, he asserts that "the spirit of Hermann and the Saxons staged its third great revolt against Rome in the time of Luther's Reformation."² While Viereck admits that Luther was more aroused by Christian than by nationalistic motives, he regards the Reformation as essentially a nationalistic movement, designed to give economic and social liberation to the people of Germany. For this reason he suggests that we return to the sources "to read such powerful champions of Luther as his friend Ulrich von Hutten, and you will find far more tribal German patriotism against the Mediterranean civilization than interest in Christianity."³ It is true, Hutten's witty shafts were aimed particularly at the evils that flourished in the papal system — the sale of offices and benefices, corruptions, immoralities. Hutten openly and fearlessly gave his support to Luther, to whom he wrote: "We are fighting for a common freedom to liberate an oppressed Fatherland."⁴ Through him the Humanistic culture employed its full strength for the success of the Protestant cause. But despite the truth of all this, it does not follow that Luther was a proponent of ideas that have given rise to the present maelstrom of disorder.

In addition to well-meaning historians who have made Luther the distant father of the monster of nationalism now grinding Europe underfoot, the very champions of the present disorder do solemnly accept such fatherhood. Jahn, whose influence in shaping Nazi ideology has been second perhaps only to that of Herder, holds that Luther was a champion of a "Northern Christianity."⁵ Alfred Rosenberg, regarded as the leading antichristian philosopher in the world today,⁶ together with Goebbels and Hitler, worships the very ground on which Luther walked. Their emphasis, of course, is not upon Luther the Christian, but upon Luther the great

2) Peter Viereck, *Metapolitics* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941), p. 13.

3) *Op. cit.*, p. 13.

4) Alexander Clarence Flick, *The Decline of the Medieval Church* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930), Vol. 2, p. 258.

5) Peter Viereck, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

6) *Op. cit.*, p. 282.

nationalist German who raised his fist against the Mediterranean usurpers and the foreign exploiters ravaging Germany's economic life. Together with Wagner and Frederick the Great, Hitler regards Luther as a spiritual comrade. These three are his chief heroes.⁷⁾ Houston Chamberlain, who lives on in Rosenberg, openly declares that Luther is, above all, a political hero rather than a religious hero, that he founded "the future of German nationalism by emancipating the Nordic from the international Rome."⁸⁾ Rosenberg chimes in with this sentiment when he declares: "Luther shattered the alien crust over our life."⁹⁾ But all of this seems utterly out of harmony with the treatment currently accorded by these men to the followers of Luther's faith. When, for example, Lutheran pastors of Germany prepared to attend the international Christian conference in Oxford, 1937, they were fiercely attacked by the men who claimed to be motivated by such ardent love for Luther. Rosenberg issued a pamphlet entitled *Protestant Pilgrims to Rome*, which had a circulation of 620,000, in which he alleged that Luther would himself be a Nazi if he were alive today. He denounced Lutheran churches as racial traitors.¹⁰⁾

This strange paradox is explained in part by the faulty presentation of the true Luther on the part of many writers, especially those who admired Luther's person and character but knew little of his spirit and faith.

It is the burden of this study to show something of that spirit and faith which was the dominating principle in Luther's life and the driving force in his productive career. To be sure, Luther gave out social theories aplenty, but these were all by-products of his great discovery of faith in the vicarious atonement of Jesus and the justifying grace of God, and of his new concept of the true dignity of the human soul renewed by faith.

Our problem is to trace Luther's idea of faith and of the Church from the era of storm and stress through his mature years. How did he place his concept of the Gospel into the framework of the state and of organized society? Did he bend the framework to suit his ideas? And what were the social and moral effects of the views he espoused? Did he want the Gospel to become a directive for a new political order? Is it true that he was unbelievably stupid in the way of earthly diplomacy and statecraft? No one will deny that Luther with his overpowering personality could have dominated every city council from Wittenberg to Koenigsberg. But this was not in his interest. Luther thought of the Gospel as a precious

7) *Op. cit.*, p. 283.

9) *Op. cit.*, p. 283.

8) *Op. cit.*, p. 283.

10) *Op. cit.*, p. 283.

pearl, and the realm of the human soul as the setting of that pearl. These jewels strung together were the Church. The Church was precious in the sight of God. How it appeared to the world made little difference to him. The external organization of the state and of human society interested him only in so far as it provided a clear channel for the growth and expression of faith and the full development of the whole man. In the *Apology* of the Augsburg Confession it is clearly held that Christ is not, in His essential nature, a lawgiver, and that the Gospel cannot "present new laws concerning the civil state," but it "permits us outwardly to use legitimate political ordinances of every nation in which we live."¹¹ These are some of the questions and problems to which the following pages address themselves.

Chapter I

Various Interpretations of the Reformation

The current none-too-complimentary association which Luther enjoys has grown directly out of an interpretation which, to say the least, fails to draw the true and full picture of the whole career of the great Reformer. By one school Luther is regarded as the colossus of the sixteenth century, the great hero who deserves to be named with Goethe and Bismarck. This view magnifies Luther as a person while it dwarfs the universals of truth which he was destined to bequeath to the world. Luther would hardly have recognized himself from the many verbal portraits which have been drawn from the angle of the hero complex. Those who share this view invariably pass over the years of Luther's activity from 1530 on. Luther's own readiness for martyrdom, so frequently expressed, shows that he did not consider himself the indispensable man. He protested vehemently against the use of his name as a designation of his followers. "How should I, poor stinking carcass that I am, come to have the children of Christ call themselves by my pitiful name? Not so, dear friends: Let us do away with party names and call ourselves Christians after Him whose teachings we have."¹² He knew that he had not called a new Church into existence, but had only purified the one which had always existed by the Gospel. It is a demonstrable fact that the true teachings and views of Luther fade out of the picture in the same degree that undue emphasis is given to his person.

Nor can the true Luther be discovered in the interpretations in which Luther becomes the author and champion of a new culture. The Reformation was indeed an emancipation. But in

11) *Concordia Triglotta*, The Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921), p. 331.

12) *Luthers Werke*, Weimar Edition, Vol. 8, p. 685.

its essence it was not the kind of emancipation that is ordinarily thought of—the beginning of a new cultural epoch, the opening of a new path for the progress of civilization. No historian will deny that the Reformation had a great influence on the modern world. Luther indeed liberated a great part of the world from domination by the medieval Church; but he desired to place the world under a new control, the inner control of faith in the Gospel of redemption, a control which the culture champions have quite disowned. It is true, culture arose in Europe, like the phoenix from its ashes, after Luther's hammer blows shattered the sarcophagus of dormant forces. But the cultural risings that followed the Reformation are at best the by-products of Luther's views. As a matter of fact, Erasmus is far more deserving as a candidate of the honors which the culture-historical school of interpreters would bestow upon Luther. It was Erasmus, not Luther, who believed in the divine endowment, the greatness and freedom, of the natural man. And Luther realized the difference that existed between himself and Erasmus. He felt that the attacks of all others were as pin pricks in comparison with those of Erasmus, "who has assailed me at the throat." Erasmus fought against Luther for the acknowledgment of man's dignity as a creature of God. Luther had an entirely different understanding of the Gospel from that of Erasmus, and he drew from the Scriptures an entirely different doctrine of man: the doctrine of the total depravity of man through original sin. "This doctrine is the premise on which everything that Luther taught and everything that he worked for as a reformer, rested."¹³ This makes it quite clear that the Reformation, in the eyes of all followers of Erasmus, was a deliverance from that which to Luther was the truth about man. While the Reformation was one of the most severe jolts ever experienced in the inner life of the world, yet it was in essence not a waking of the world out of its cultural sleep, but out of the long sleep of moral and spiritual dormancy.

More common than either of these views of Luther is the interpretation which makes him a great national hero. Most certainly the Reformation gave to the German people a liberation hitherto unexperienced. True, Martin Luther was a German by birth, but in spirit he belongs to all nations. He was just as much interested in Tyndale's English translation of the Bible as he was in his own German translation. When he fought against the Church of Rome, he fought not, primarily, as a German, but as a Christian. He was indeed interested in Germany as a nation, and

13) Hermann Sasse, *Was heisst lutherisch?* Translated under the title *Here We Stand* by Theodore G. Tappert (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1938), p. 31.

he had a deep resentment against domination by an alien power. What he objected to was not primarily the alien language, not the alien culture, but the alien and specious religious spirit. He always felt himself more closely drawn to kindred souls in Italy or Sweden than to those of his own German countrymen who were pawns of the hierarchy. Had Luther been a political opportunist, he could have made alignment with the restive powers that were ready to strike strong blows in the interest of national liberation. Had he been an unscrupulous syncretist, he could have welded the various political and cultural factors of Germany into a formidable power, which could have defied Pope and Emperor. Had that been his interest, Luther could have antedated Bismarck by three and one half centuries. But his spirit moved on a higher level.

Chapter II

Luther's New Moral Principles

The faith struggles which were fought out in the soul of Martin Luther in the quiet of his lonely monastery cell produced new spiritual life principles of great clarity and vigor. At first his new discoveries in the realm of religion were hemmed in by the traditional religious viewpoints, but their vital force soon hurdled the traditional confines and ultimately caused a complete separation from the old ecclesiastical order and achieved a character of independence. In wrestling with the universal problems of humanity in the religious realm, Luther at length discovered an original approach. Through the fierce combat of thoughts that were tantamount to soul struggles he pressed on to spiritual frontiers from which he viewed a new land of evangelical glory. His discovery seemed to him as the very gates of Paradise. In the supreme quest to save his soul and to win the assurance of God's pardon he was driven into the convent in the hope of finding reconciliation with God by means of the most approved method of his day. The monastic escape soon seemed to him a contradiction. In the final analysis, monasticism required that a man must work out his own salvation. To withdraw from the world because the world is inherently evil did not solve the problem for him. With the force of assaults the perplexing paradox of religion and life, sin and grace, Law and Gospel, tugged at his anguished soul. He was not able to tone down the force of God's Law, as others had done, so that man's moral guilt could be diminished. It soon dawned upon him that the monastic philosophy was an effort to adjust God's Law to man's ability to keep it. He saw in this both the dishonor of God and a false pride in man.

Luther's triumph over these perplexing problems was discovered in the domain of the human will or attitude. All virtue

or vice is to be judged here. The Christian victory is determined in man's attitude and will toward God. There can be no clearing of the mental ray until faith in the sin-forgiving God has claimed man's trust. Man's approach to peace through justification has its first step in the realization of his moral failure and guilt before God. This discovery of the doctrine of man's moral obligation to God is as important as the discovery of the doctrine of God's moral imputation of righteousness to man. Thus Luther's experience as a monk became a steppingstone rather than a stumbling block. He rediscovered the high ideals of absolute obedience to God. To him this obedience is demonstrated in its ultimate force in the willing acceptance of the divine gift of salvation.¹⁴⁾

In Luther's thought all true morality and the very essence of the soul life is to feel one's self a tool of God and in all one's duties to be conscious of His honor. Only the doctrine of justification can liberate man from an egotistic philosophy. It is the persuasion that God is willing to serve man and ready to forgive man that makes man ashamed of his self-seeking ways.¹⁵⁾ Naturally, what God gives by grace, man needs no longer to seek by his own merit. When God wins man to Himself by the gift of Christian faith, man immediately comes into a relationship with God which calls for a joyful and willing service of God. This new will of man in harmony and union with God's will is something higher than law. Its function is entirely in the realm of love. Luther's Christian piety was a return to the purely religious character of the Christian ethic. There is only one truly ethical religious relationship to God, one of complete self-surrender to God in faith. Out of this relationship the whole Christian ethos will evolve quite naturally. Thus the one great moral imperative is to be wholly before God. "Faith is the highest and the most real moral demand, and at the same time it is a gift of grace."¹⁶⁾ This is the high paradox and the leading idea of the religious ethic of Martin Luther. Man's obligations to God are taken out of the domain of must and transferred into the sphere of willing service.¹⁷⁾ Now the laws of the church become distasteful. Their effect is destructive because they force a man to do a work in the hope of receiving the assurance of God's love before the love of God has made him willing to do the work out of free response.

All moral life has its impetus in God or in self. To Luther

14) Weimar, I, p. 227, 27.

15) Karl Holl, *Luther, Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr), Vol. I, p. 207.

16) Ernst Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Church* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1931), Vol. 2, p. 495.

17) Weimar Edition, VI, p. 27, 10.

only that moral life which is inspired and determined by a filial relation to God is good.¹⁸⁾ To make one's thoughts and works subservient to Him in whom we live and move and have our being, to anchor one's human powers in Him, and to direct all questions of life by this principle—this is the moral force that arises in man as a result of the assurance of forgiveness. This living unto God was the secret of Luther's heroic faith and the constant source of his courage. Thus in his attitude towards the world, in his personal duties as a social being, in his relationship to earthly ambitions and occupations, to the sorrows and joys of life, the believing child of God was given a range of liberty and assurance hitherto unknown and sharply distinguished from the Catholic and later Reformed views. The thesis which Luther established in his essay *On the Freedom of a Christian Man*: that a Christian is a free lord, subject to no one, but at the same time a servant of all, gives man a freedom of decision bound by no external law but directed only by that inner necessity which is the fruit of fellowship with God. This condition always produces a true desire to serve one's fellow man and to contribute to the uplift of social life. In the faith which claims God for self Luther saw the power to cleanse the heart and to produce true Christian integrity.¹⁹⁾ If faith is the power that brings man into contact with the living God, there will follow the resolve to put off whatever is out of harmony with that union and willingly to do that which this communion necessarily impels.²⁰⁾ Luther's rise to this high power of religious consciousness was his unique contribution to the world.

These new principles were the basis of a new order. He himself lived by these new convictions, and he won others to them. Thus he became the champion of a new truth. His principles had the power of setting new goals and establishing new motives for life.

The common people were indeed not able to appreciate fully the principles involved in Luther's soul struggles. But they saw clearly that his ideals expressed their own fondest aspirations. Man essentially longs for peace with God. The common people in Luther's day were not interested in the speculations of the Scholastics. They were interested in the peace and harmony of their own lives. This explains why Luther's 97 Theses on Scholasticism drew hardly any attention, while his 95 Theses on Indulgences, relating to the secret of man's peace with God, written only a few weeks later, stirred the soul of the world to its depths.

18) *Op. cit.*, I, p. 427, 19.

19) *Op. cit.*, VII, p. 26, 13.

20) *Op. cit.*, V, p. 159, 38.

When men saw Luther's principles at work, they felt themselves bound to him with the closest ties of loyalty. His program struck a loyal response in the hearts of the common people, for it aroused aspirations which had long been subdued. Luther had attained the freedom of a Christian man. Through his unbounded faith in the love and care of God, revealed in the pardoning grace of a divine Savior, he had come to a joy in living which was far deeper than that of Humanism. Religion for Luther has thus stepped out of the material, substantial sphere, which was merely accompanied by thought and feeling, and has entered into the intellectual, psychological, spiritual sphere.²¹⁾ He became a leader of men. His joyous faith delivered him from all fear of man, of the hierarchy, of Pope and emperor. And it was fear that had weighed down the consciences of men for generations.

Such were the directive forces that motivated Luther in all his actions. They were the secret of his social views. Had they been on a lower level, his cause would soon have been corrupted by an inordinate syncretism with the existing political and social forces of his day. He was resolved to preserve at all costs the ethics of this pure faith. There should not be any sphere of human life and work to which the Christian standards should not be applicable. Had his religious ethic been less vigorous and creative, his movement would have resulted in the quietism of the Orient or the narrow fanaticism of a sect.

Chapter III

The Moral Necessity of Luther's Ethic

When, on December 10, 1520, Luther cast the *Summa Angelica*, the most highly respected Catholic confession, into the fire, he voiced his protest against the moral order of the Church. Already at this early date he was breathing the free air of a moral ethic in which the willing obedience of faith becomes the only fulfillment of the divine Law. His argument is that only Christian faith can give that which God primarily requires of man, namely, willing obedience.²²⁾ Scholars have dwelt on some of Luther's striking sayings on this point.²³⁾ The importance of faith and trust in God, based on the Word, for a truly sanctified life is given tremendous emphasis by Luther.²⁴⁾ Thus the impulse of the individual conscience becomes the new rule for conduct, and the religious spirit which issues from faith exerts control over all the directions of life. It is

21) Ernst Troeltsch, *op. cit.*, p. 469.

22) Weimar Edition, VII, p. 26, 13.

23) Cf. Karl Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 222.

24) Ernst Troeltsch, *op. cit.*, p. 471.

true, the channel in which this new spiritual principle moves is still the law of the Decalog and of the New Testament because these constitute the formula of the natural moral standard. This means that every truly moral force issues from faith. With Luther the religious relation itself was the absolute value and the ultimate source of all God-pleasing progress. All moral values, whether in the realm of self-cultivation or in the relation to one's fellow men, have their origin in this free, willing, joyful appropriation of God. It is this God-given spirit which now blossoms out and sends forth the fragrance of a God-pleasing life. To use Luther's own words, "Out of all this we come to the conclusion that a Christian man lives not in himself but in Christ and his neighbor: in Christ through faith, in his neighbor through love. Through faith he goes out of himself into God; from God he again descends through love and yet remains always in God and in the divine love."²⁵⁾ Thus the believer who knows himself a beneficiary of God's unbounded love becomes a sort of Christ to his neighbor. This principle becomes a moral necessity in relation to man. It is the seed thought of all Luther's social theories. The love of God to man inspires the love of man for man. This is Luther's powerful social principle. It is this moral direction as a pure necessity of Luther's religious ethic that constitutes a most formidable social principle. This contribution makes Luther one of the truest religionists of all times. His convictions were not motivated by social or economic relations. They arose simply out of the development of the religious thought itself. "They were based essentially and independently upon the religious idea, which alone gave rise to social, economic, and political consequences."²⁶⁾ Social, economic, and political causes had nothing whatever to do with the source and nature of Luther's struggle. The primary cause was the religious idea, pure and simple. "For that very reason it is impossible to connect the Reformation world of thought with any particular social class."²⁷⁾

About the only connection that can be detected between Luther's struggle and the character of the world about him may be found in the growing tendency of the age to emphasize the value of personal religious experience. Some historians saw in the growing independence of national states, the rise of city civilization, and the expansion of economic interests a setting that led to greater religious independence of thought.

It is this creative force in Luther that makes him a living person today. His struggles produced universals of thought that

25) *Op. cit.*, p. 495.

26) *Op. cit.*, p. 488.

27) *Ibid.*

exerted tremendous influence on institutions and principles of a universal character. Had this not been so, Luther would have been merely the founder of a new sect or a new religious order.

In contending for this idealistic ethic which finds its life and force in God, Luther studiously steered clear of fusion with sectarian thought which would disturb this principle. The idea of God's grace which was capable of winning man to a complete love and trust of God meant so much to Luther that he was unwilling to give too much emphasis to the earthly expression of that life. He did not want the effect to obscure the cause. He feared that human achievement would come in for too much honor and that it would become the criterion by which the true spiritual life is judged. The pure grace of God is appropriated simply by trust. It is not to be bound by, dependent upon, or made subservient to, any earthly consideration. The spiritual life in and through the free grace of God must objectively precede and produce everything else.

A pure ethic in relation to God must produce a pure ethic in relation to man. Luther held that the love of the neighbor is to have a place in the stead of self-love, not alongside of it. A love which first seeks self is a sinful love. For this reason he condemns the excessive, rich bequests for the support of altars, the Mass, churches, and cloisters. This cannot be God's will. His voice is pitched high as he condemns this wastefulness in the midst of human need and characterizes it as self-honor in the last analysis. Works of love toward the fellow man are more God-pleasing than all this outward show, even as God loves man more than wood and stone.²⁸⁾ The ideal of achieving the common good becomes a hallowed principle in his social ethic. Whatever activity in life has no element of contributing for the common good has no justification for existence. The monastic life is to be condemned because it robs society of a useful activity. The estate of marriage is to be honored by all because it improves social life and thus enhances the advancement of society.²⁹⁾

Such were the considerations that led to Luther's clear-cut principles of the *Beruf*. A person who robs society of the benefit of his work by being idle is living on the sweat and blood of others. To find honest joy in work because it is God's order is a mark of a Christian in the midst of a world where work is generally regarded as a necessary evil. A Christian would work even if he had more than he needed.³⁰⁾ A man cannot have God without the

28) Weimar Edition, II, p. 280, 12.

29) Karl Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 259.

30) Weimar Edition, XXIX, p. 441, 19.

desire to do His will. Human work is the channel by which God achieves His will. Thus God's command to work unites with man's desire to work.³¹⁾ The daily inspiration of the Christian man in striving to be faithful to his calling is produced by the conviction that one's work accomplishes God's honor and the neighbor's welfare.³²⁾

Such attitudes run through the entire structure of Luther's social views. His interest is not primarily in the social pattern but in true social motives. For this reason his tireless activities in the field of education both for children and adults characterized Luther's life to the very end. His deep concern was in the building of the individual personality which has the "mind of Christ" in all social relationships. A Christian society is unthinkable without the training of the individual in Christian motives and attitudes. The external order of political, economic, and social life does not produce this inner change. Luther knew that it is impossible to solve the social problem without solving the problem of the human heart.

Chapter IV

Luther's Social Theories in Their Practical Expressions

Luther's social views were the imperative and directive flowing from his religious convictions, but he never fell into the error of confusing a pure ethic in relation to God with the social expression of that ethic in relation to man. His religious convictions would not allow him to confuse salvation and sociology. He knew too well that the essence of religion lay in an upward direction, a relation to God predicated upon the love and merit of Christ. He who had liberated the true religious principle from the mass of subjective processes in which it had been implicated, would never bring his new liberty into another kind of enslavement. Luther was resolved to preserve the objectivity of grace at all times and under all circumstances. He knew that the certainty of salvation did not depend upon any condition in man. For this reason Luther's social theories are always thought of as the necessary and inevitable result of his religious ethic. He believed that all the fruits of the social life were the result of the right relationship between the Redeemer and the redeemed soul. In this point he never wavered. All of Luther's social theories begin with the individual who as a renewed being has the power to influence and affect society. Luther guarded himself against the error of believing that society could be permanently improved by anybody else than renewed individuals. The social Gospel was distasteful

31) Weimar Edition, XX, p. 152, 6.

32) Karl Holl, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

to him because it envisioned the improvement of society without the improvement of the individual.

But the virile force of Luther's religious ethic produced social interests far more liberal and wide in scope than is evident in a social awareness in Luther's followers. From the time Luther framed the Ninety-five Theses until he acted as arbiter in a feud between the Counts of Mansfeld a few hours before his death, Luther revealed an interest in the betterment of society which towers above the social conceptions of any of his predecessors. The forty-third of his Ninety-five Theses is a dim flash of that social principle which was infolded in the nature and spirit of his faith: "Christians should be taught that he who gives alms to the poor does a far better work than he who purchases a letter of indulgence." Luther's piercing eye fell upon the social injustices of his day, and he did not hesitate to uncover the source of social perversion, to attack and condemn the ruthless debauchers of society, and to prescribe the corrective. In this respect Luther surpassed the Fathers of the early Church, whose contempt for the world produced a detachment in which we look in vain for a definite social philosophy.

Luther probably never thought through the ideas of social freedom as applied to the whole of society. Certain it is that he did not hitch his conception of Christianity to any existing social order. He did not take a functional or utilitarian view of Christianity by which patronage is offered to a specific social system as essential to the Christian life. But he was confident that evangelical Christianity would raise society to levels in which the religion of the Cross would achieve "a mystical elevation of mankind," as Troeltsch calls it.³³⁾ To be sure, Luther was conscious of no gap between his social theory and practice. His approach to the whole problem of social morality is essentially spiritual. He never employed any kind of power strategy in order to secure himself or his cause in a position in which he was safe or successful. His social teaching centers in the *theologia crucis* which is a sort of "sacrificial interpretation of social duty."³⁴⁾ What Christ has done for us, that we must do for others, even when it involves persecution, danger, death.

Hope for a renewed world society was not in the sphere of Luther's thinking. He was primarily otherworldly. Christ's children are in the world but not of it. Their affection is set on things above. "In illness or public crisis his mind readily turned to apocalypticism."³⁵⁾ And yet, the Christian, according to Luther,

33) Quoted by John T. McNeill, *Christian Hope for World Society*, p. 107.

34) *Op. cit.*, p. 108.

35) *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

does not flee human society. The Christian, whose life is higher than its surroundings, is to purify society. The Christian has a solemn duty to use every lawful method to bring about a worthy social life for the common good and in harmony with the expressed will of God. While Luther disallows the dream of a Christian world order, his own expectation of the renovation of the Church carried along with it, to a degree which he was not concerned to define, the hope of a spiritual transformation of society. He himself took the lead in condemning social evils. His interest in the order of the social life never wavered. The very nature of the religious force he was seeking to release in the world implies the renewal of social life. Luther had tremendous confidence in the moral force of faith, which, as he said, "ever increases through its own works."³⁶⁾ The child of God, blessed with the bounty of God, cannot be other than honest and liberal in his social dealings since "God is rich enough."³⁷⁾ Luther's doctrine of the priesthood of believers implied a social force of the first magnitude. While the priesthood of believers as affirmed by Luther has often been held to imply individualism, it in reality signifies mutuality and communion in religious and social duties. All Christians are priests, "worthy to pray for others, to teach one another," and "every Christian is to give himself to his neighbor" that we may be "Christ's one to another."³⁸⁾

This principle leads to an acceptance of the world as the opposite of monastic seclusion from the world. "It is precisely in the spirit of mutual service within the life of the world that Christian love is demonstrated."³⁹⁾ Luther's distinctive ideas of the *Beruf* implies an acceptance of the world and of faithfulness in one's particular vocational activity as an act of willing obedience to God and unselfish service to man. These new social conceptions of Luther penetrated into many different areas of human interest, as we shall now show.

Luther's ethic of labor called for a willing acceptance of work on the principle that this is the divine order. True enough, the Christian in pursuing his labor also has an interest in the upkeep of his family and home, but the difference between the Christian workingman and a non-Christian one is that the former labors in faith, that is, in the faith that God will bless his work. The Christian labors as though everything depended on his work; he believes that everything depends on God. "You supply lock and door and let God make them secure; you labor and let Him bestow the fruits on your labor; you rule and let Him give success to your efforts; ...

36) *Op. cit.*, p. 108.38) *Ibid.*37) *Ibid.*39) Ernst Troeltsch, *op. cit.*, p. 471.

you preach and let Him make hearts pious; you eat and drink and let Him strengthen and nourish you. In all our doings it is He who must do all things and who deserves all honor." ⁴⁰⁾

The principle of labor unions Luther regarded as essentially right, and he refused to give his support to those who objected to the guilds in which the interest of the laboring man was sought. But he publicly demanded that the guilds conduct their business according to Christian principles.⁴¹⁾ He does not hesitate to use his pulpit to condemn the closed-shop idea of certain guilds in his day, whom he accuses of assuming a despotic rule over business. The social spirit of Lutheranism is demonstrated in other evidences of interest in the welfare and protection of the laborer. In a report of the Saxon visitations of the year 1555 a complaint of servants who cannot attend church because of working hours is upheld and employers are admonished to correct this condition. In another order of the year 1580 employers are held to eliminate Sunday work for servants and no longer to pay the weekly salary on Sundays. These are the early beginnings of laws enacted for the betterment of working conditions.

Luther's interest in the forgotten man is one of the brightest rays that shone through the prism of his soul, now renewed by the love of God. The existing relief program of the Church he held to be altogether inadequate because the emphasis was placed on the donor and the gift rather than the need to be met. He gave a new emphasis to adequate provision for the person who found himself in financial straits. The new principle he introduced called for such relief and assistance as would actually lift the needy person to self-maintenance instead of strengthening him in indolence. Since the days of St. Francis begging enjoyed a coloring of sanctity. The mendicant orders had the full benediction of the Church. But Luther held to the new ideal that poverty should be entirely removed and that the forgotten people should be reclaimed to become decent and self-respecting members of society. The doctrine of the priesthood of believers and the bond of brotherhood among them impelled this view. The high point of Luther's social program in respect to relief was reached when he had the courage to suggest — and this was a bold step in a day of guild-controlled orders — that relief be extended not only to the sick and weak but also to the straitened business man and the ambitious youth who aspires to a profession. He felt that general taxation should provide the funds for such needs. There is on record a lengthy document in which Luther opens to view for the first time his idea of a com-

40) Weimar Edition, XXXI, I, p. 436, 26.

41) Weimar Edition, XVIII, p. 536, 1.

munity chest under the administration of cities. His suggestions for the community chest in Wittenberg and Leisnig expressly called for loans to be extended to the farmer and the little businessman.

Luther's social views on wealth and business were clear-cut. To him the possession of wealth and the service of God were not mutually exclusive ideas, but he saw clearly the danger of unconsecrated wealth and the power of money to control the heart and estrange the soul from God. Any kind of enslavement to earthly values, whether by rich or poor, he considered a snare of the devil. But wealth accompanied by the liberty of faith offers opportunity for a rich service to mankind. Luther no longer holds to the medieval poverty ideal, and he regards the possession and investment of money as compatible with the Christian spirit. His friend Lucas Cranach, one of the heaviest taxpayers of the city of Wittenberg, had heavy investments from which he lived. But there is evident in Luther's thinking a strong distrust of the money lords who live in far-off cities and exercise a mechanical control of the market, thus destroying the local communal and co-operative order. This he feared would disturb group loyalties and tend to widen the gap between the rich and the poor. He condemns the interlocked money powers and the control which they exert in reducing the little businessman to subservience. It was never Luther's idea to Christianize the ethics of business without Christianizing the individual agents who were responsible for outrageous conditions. He knew that the world would never be guided by the principles of the Sermon on the Mount, because all had not faith. "I have often contended," he writes, "that the world cannot be ruled with the Gospel and the power of Christian love, but by rigid laws and discipline and authority, for the world is against the Gospel and is not ruled by Christian love."⁴² But he never failed to condemn business practices which violated the Law of God. Small wonder that he lifted his voice against excessive interest. He relates that in Leipzig a 30-per-cent rate of interest was charged. In Naumburg it was 50 per cent. "That means," he remarks, "that a peasant or a merchant is devoured in one year."⁴³ He felt that the loaning of money on interest has Christian sanction only under certain circumstances. It is never right to charge interest when money is loaned to a needy fellow man. He always held to the principle that the Christian cannot keep for himself what he does not need so long as the neighbor has need. This allows the lending of money with interest only to one who has more than he needs, in which case the loaning of money benefits both parties. The amount of interest to be required Luther felt should be proportioned to the profit

42) Weimar Edition, XV, p. 306, 28.

43) Weimar Edition, LI, p. 364.

realized on the loan. The possibility of the destruction of a crop by the elements should be taken into consideration.⁴⁴⁾ In the conviction that the needy person should be able to borrow money without interest he never wavered. To take advantage of the need of the neighbor by requiring interest seemed to him to be against the spirit of the Gospel.

The Christian has a right to conduct business and to own property. He writes: "If a Christian is to give, he must have. If he has nothing, he can give nothing; and if he is to give tomorrow or the day after or a year from then, for Christ demands that we give as long as we live, then he is not to give everything away today."⁴⁵⁾ But every Christian will regard his property as entrusted to him by God and as belonging to the neighbor. Money in itself is neither good nor bad. It all depends upon the way it is used. That which a man possesses becomes a *Gut* (in the original meaning of the German word used for property) only when it serves to bring happiness and blessing to many, especially the needy, and is not used to pile up a fortune.

The very spirit of capitalism seemed to Luther to be incompatible with the Christian life. Every man should work for the love of work. It is no sin to be ambitious and to strive to get ahead in earthly things, but the true motive must never be lost sight of. The desire for gain for the sake of gain cannot have God's benediction. Luther looked with suspicious eyes on the growing power of capitalism, and he felt it would spell the collapse of the little businessman. He publicly condemned monopolizing, forming a ring, feigning bankruptcy, as trickery of the capitalists who take advantage of the poor. In his pamphlet on Trade and Usury he declares that the companies have learned the trick of placing such spices as pepper, ginger, and saffron in damp vaults in order to increase their weight. There is not a single article out of which they cannot make an unfair profit through false measuring, counting, or weighing, or by producing artificial colors. He accuses them of conducting business on the principle that the price is to be as high as possible, which violates the very essence of Christian ethics. The principle of credit seemed to Luther to be both foolish and wicked. Those who sell for as high a price as they wish, who take or give credit, are the sources of all sorts of wide-spreading wickedness and trickery. He made the constructive suggestion that price levels be determined on the basic standard of the daily wage of the common laborer.

44) Weimar Edition, VI, p.12.

45) Weimar Edition, LI, p.384, 4.

The doctrine of the separation of the Church from the State never meant for Luther a doctrine of the separation of the Church from society. One hand of the Christian is uplifted to receive the pardoning grace of the divine Savior; the other is outstretched to the needs and burdens of mankind. Thus a pure religious ethic produces a pure social ethic in relation to man.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

- Luthers ausgewaehlte Werke.* Unter Mitwirkung von Hermann Barge, Georg Buchwaldt, Paul Joachimsen, Paul Kalkoff, Friedrich Wilhelm Schmidt, Wolfgang Stammeler, Henry Thode; herausgegeben von Hans Heinrich Borchardt. Muenchen: Georg Mueller, 1923.
- Luthers saemmtliche Schriften.* Edited according to the edition of Dr. Joh. Georg Walch by A. F. Hoppe, 23 vols.; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1880 ff.
- Concordia Triglotta.* The Symbolical Books of the Ev. Lutheran Church, German-Latin-English; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1921.
- Weimar Luther Edition.* Published by Herman Boehlau; Weimar, 1883 ff. Collaborators: Knaake, Pietsch, Drescher, Kawerau, Walther, Buchwald, Cohrs, Albrecht, N. Mueller, J. Ficker, Thiele, Koffmane, Kroker, Brenner.

Secondary

- Flick, Alexander Clarence, *The Decline of the Medieval Church.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1930. 2 vols.
- Holl, Karl, *Luther.* Vol. I, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte*, 3 vols.; 6th edition. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr. 593 pages.
- Kidd, B. J., *Documents Illustrative of the Continental Reformation.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1911. 742 pages.
- Krauth, Charles P., *The Conservative Reformation and Its Theology.* Philadelphia: The United Lutheran Publication House, 1913. 840 pages.
- Martin Luther, Selected Works of*, with Introductions and Notes. Translated into English. Philadelphia: A. J. Holman Company, 1915. 6 vols.
- McGiffert, Arthur Cushman, *Martin Luther, The Man and His Work.* New York: The Century Co., 1914. 397 pages.
- McGovern, William Montgomery, *From Luther to Hitler.* Cambridge: The Riverside Press, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1941. 683 pages.
- Schapiro, Jacob, Salwyn, *Social Reform and the Reformation.* Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University; Vol. XXXIV, No. 2, *Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*, 90 vols. New York: Columbia University, 1909. 160 pages.
- Smith, Preserved, *The Life and Letters of Martin Luther.* Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1911. 490 pages.
- Troeltsch, Ernst, *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen.* Tuebingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1923. 994 pages.
- Troeltsch, Ernst, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches.* Translated by Olive Wyon. New York.
- Viereck, Peter, *Metapolitics.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941. 335 pages.
- Weber, Max, *The Protestant Ethic.* Translated by Talcott Parsons from the 1920 edition of *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*; edited by Max Weber. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1930. 292 pages.

Los Angeles, Calif.

CARL WALTER BERNER

Sermon Study on 1 Cor. 15:12-20

Eisenach Epistle Selection for Easter Sunday

In no other chapter of the Bible is the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead treated so thoroughly and comprehensively as in the fifteenth chapter of Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians. The irrefutable fact and reality of Christ's resurrection; its importance for Christian faith and hope and life; the reality, the time, and the manner of the believers' resurrection; the marvelous effects of the believers' resurrection on their bodies, all these facts are revealed in this uniquely remarkable chapter with such clarity, in such beauty of language, in so convincing a manner, engendering and strengthening faith unwavering and assurance immovable, as only God, the Fountainhead of life and the Author of resurrection unto life eternal, can reveal these truths transcending human understanding. The Eisenach epistle selection for Easter Sunday, 1 Cor. 15:12-20, speaks of the importance of Christ's resurrection for the Christian's faith and life and hope.

"Now, if Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" v. 12. Very significantly the Apostle does not write, If it is preached that Christ rose from the dead. He so words his thoughts that two important truths are emphasized. The one, that Christ is being preached; Christ, through whom alone they became what they are, chap. 1:2-9 (eight times the name of Christ is mentioned), Christ, in whom they still believed, whom they were not willing to reject, 15:1, 2. The second, and in this connection the more important, truth, is that this Christ, their only Savior, is being preached "that He rose from the dead." The Corinthians had heard and were hearing of no other Christ than the Christ who rose from the dead. The conditional clause "if Christ," etc., does not mean to cast any doubt on the fact of this preaching. On the contrary, from the beginning of Paul's apostleship, Acts 9:19, 20, to the day he penned his letter to the Corinthians, the risen Christ had been the sum and substance of his preaching. Cp. 15:1-11.

Christ "rose," rather "has been raised," ἐγέρθη. Paul uses the perfect in order to denote the resurrection as an accomplished fact whose consequences still endure. While the passive ἐγείρωμαι is often used intransitively in the sense of awake, rise, as a synonym of ἀνίσταμαι, Paul quite evidently used it here in its transitive sense, to be roused, raised, in order to show that the same God who raised Christ from the dead is able to raise other dead people. Christ was raised "from dead," the absence of the article stresses the qualitative force. Christ was raised from such as were dead. Before He was raised, He had actually been numbered among those

dead and buried. So it had been foretold in the infallible word of Scripture. Ps. 16:9, 10; 22:15; Is. 53:8, 9, 12; Zech. 13:7. Friends and foes, the judge and the plaintiffs, were convinced that He was dead. Matt. 27:63; 28:13 f.; Mark 15:42-47; John 19:30-42; Acts 5:28. This dead Christ has been raised from the dead, His body reunited with His soul, brought back to life. This second fact the apostle had proved beyond the possibility of refutation by appealing to the remarkable change the preaching of the risen Christ had wrought in the Corinthians, vv. 1, 2; to the witness of Scripture, wherein God Himself spoke, vv. 3, 4; to the unanimous testimony of many trustworthy witnesses, vv. 5-7; to the miraculous appearance of Christ and its life-changing effect upon Paul, vv. 8-10.

That is the Christ continually being preached among you, a Christ, a Messiah raised from the dead. Now, if that is as the case stands, how, then, is it possible that some of you are saying that there is no resurrection of the dead? There were some, *τινές*, whose names the Apostle does not want to mention. How many and who they were, whether they formed a large or a small group, we are not told.

The congregation as such had not yet accepted the view of these "some." Yet the congregation had not taken the proper stand against them. Apparently the deniers were being tolerated, for Paul writes, "They are saying," *λέγουσιν*, they were still continuing to hold their error. Nor do we read a syllable of any action on the part of the congregation against this dangerous falsehood. If there had been any action, it must have been too feeble and halfhearted to be effective. Error spreads, like cancer, from a small beginning, often disregarded because it is seemingly harmless. In order to win back these erring brethren and to prevent the whole congregation from being infected by this dangerous, soul-destroying error, Paul proceeds to show the real nature of this subversion of the very foundations of Christianity. Yet he does not treat these erring members as heathen men and publicans, nor does he call upon the congregation to put away such wicked men out of their midst as he did 1 Cor. 5:1, 13. From the fact that Paul argues with them on the basis of the resurrection of Christ and proves to them that the denial of the resurrection of the dead is tantamount to a denial of Christ's resurrection, we may safely conclude that these erring Corinthians still accepted the fundamentals of Christianity, the death and resurrection of Christ. Vv. 1-11 had been addressed to all the members of the Corinthian congregation to which these "some" belonged.

Paul still regards them as brethren, but as erring brethren, erring in a doctrine directly affecting the very foundation of their faith; still they had, owing to a blessed inconsistency, not yet

drawn the unescapable conclusion from their premise. In the Second Letter these erring brothers are not mentioned. It seems, therefore, that Paul's instruction bore fruit, that they saw the error of their way and returned to soundness of faith, so that there was no need of proceeding against them as obstinate errorists or heretics, Titus 3:10, 11.

There is no resurrection of the dead, was the bold assertion of these men. Note that they denied the possibility of a resurrection, an ἀνάστασις, an arising from the grave, a return to life, of such as were dead. Death and resurrection seemed to them contradictory opposites. "Rising again" is an activity and every self-activity presupposes the life of the individual, while here not the living but the dead are under consideration. Death, however, excludes life and activity; death brings on decay, a dissolution of the body into its component elements. How, then, is it possible that dead people shall rise again, that their decomposed bodies should ever be able to come back to life?

How does Paul meet their argument? We read: "But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen," v. 13. Paul does not meet these erring brethren on the ground of reason and philosophy. Every argument that reason can advance for the possibility of a resurrection of the body may be refuted or at least rendered doubtful by other arguments seemingly or actually just as plausible. The Christians could never be sure of their faith if it rested on human reasoning, on arguments of man's fallible mind. Therefore Paul goes to the infallible source of truth, to God's revelation. The Corinthian Christians believed that Christ had risen from the dead, and they believed this on the basis of God's revelation in Holy Writ and in the Gospel as preached by the Apostles, vv. 1-11, the accredited ambassadors of God, who proved their divine authority by miracles such as only God could perform; compare Mark 16:20; Acts 14:8-13; 15:12; Heb. 2:3, 4. On this divine revelation concerning Christ's resurrection the Corinthians had based their eternal salvation, v. 2. Now, if the statement of "some" were true that "there is not a resurrection of dead," then there is not, and never was, and never can be, a resurrection of Christ.

"And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain," the Apostle continues his argumentation.

The ἄρα designates what follows as a matter of course. If Christ has not been raised, then the obvious inference is that Paul's preaching is vain. Note the emphatic placing of κενόν at the beginning of the clause. Vain is our preaching! Κενός signifies that which is void of content, having no substance, no reality. Consistently Paul had been preaching a Christ that had risen, while

in reality Christ had not risen since dead do not rise. Then Paul would indeed have been what the Athenians had called him, a babbler, and worse than that, a proclaimer of falsehood. His preaching would not have been a message of such importance, a tiding of such great joy, as to warrant the sending of a special emissary. It would not have been a κήρυγμα worthy of this name. It would have been empty fiction without foundation in fact. Paul's proclamation that Jesus Christ is the Lord would have been the deification of a man dead and buried, on the same line as the apotheoses of their heroes by blind pagans, an unfounded myth spun out of thin air, a fairy tale without the semblance of reality. And since the Corinthians would have put their trust in this vain, empty, lying proclamation, since their faith would have rested on less than sand, on something void of truth and reality, their faith and trust would have been empty, as unfounded and unreal as its foundation, the preaching of the resurrection of Christ. Paul, a storyteller, a dispenser of fairy tales! Christian faith a nonentity, an empty fancy, deprived of its content, the risen Christ! For if dead are not raised, then is Christ not raised! And if Christ is not raised, our preaching is vain, and your faith is vain.

Nor is this all. "Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that He raised up Christ; whom He raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised," vv. 15, 16. If so be, εἰτερ ἄρα, supposing it to be sure. If that were an assured fact that there is no resurrection of dead, v. 12, that dead men are not raised, v. 15, then, indeed, the Apostle and all his fellow preachers would be found false witnesses, ψευδομάρτυρες, witnesses that testify to a falsehood. The preachers of such a Gospel could not be God's emissaries. They would be despicable, damnable liars, far more wicked than those false witnesses that rose up against Naboth, charging him with doing what he did not do; 1 Kings 21:13; more wicked than the false witnesses against Jesus, Matt. 26:59, 62; 27:13. Naboth was a human being, a fellow mortal; Jesus was standing before His accusers in His state of humiliation, Phil. 2:7. The preachers of Christ's resurrection, however, would stand convicted of being false witnesses of God, of telling a falsehood concerning the Most High, yea, of witnessing against, κατά, God, in opposition to Him, in flat denial of and contradiction to His will and truth. Paul and his fellow preachers of the risen Christ claimed that they were heralds, messengers, of the only true God and that their message was given to them by revelation of the God of truth. This claim would, like their message, be without the slightest foundation, the mistaken claim of deluded fanatics deceived by their own hallucinations or the lying boast of deceivers, swindlers, deliberately

setting out to hoax mankind. For they preached contrary to facts, contrary to God, that God had raised Christ, whom He did not raise, if so be that the deniers of a resurrection of dead were right. "For if dead are not being raised, then neither Christ [who was dead and buried] has been raised," v. 16.

The Apostle repeats what he has already stated, v. 13. We may be surprised that he repeats in so short a time the same fact, moreover, a fact so obvious, so incontestable, so self-evident, that it might seem a waste of energy to repeat it. Yet it was just this simple fact that some of the Corinthians had forgotten when they followed their proud reason, which regarded the doctrine of resurrection of the body as folly, and when they made bold to say, "There is no resurrection of dead." Paul knows the need of hammering home the essential truths of Christianity by constant repetition. Luther learned that lesson from him. At Marburg he had written the brief word "This is My body" on the table before him and constantly recurred to these plain and simple words to refute all the arguments which his opponents advanced to prove the impossibility of the Real Presence in the Lord's Supper. It is the gravest mistake a pastor can make when he thinks that he need not emphasize and re-emphasize the essentials of Christianity, that there is no necessity to reiterate and impress upon the minds of his hearers over and over again those simple yet so vital truths without which our faith cannot exist, against which Satan rages with all the fury of hell, which seem so foolish or so impossible or so needless to our own flesh and blood, while our eternal life and salvation depends on them. Phil. 3:1 b.

The repetition v. 16 serves also to introduce a new train of thought, that of the utter uselessness of Christianity, the futility of Christian faith and life and hope, if there is no resurrection of the dead. "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins," v. 17.

Paul calls attention to the dreadful consequences if Christ has not been raised. Not every trust misplaced, not every faith unfounded, is a matter of great importance, of decisive significance. Misplaced confidence, *e. g.*, in weather reports, in advertisements, etc., may merely result in some inconvenience, in some slight loss of time or money or pleasure. If our faith in Christ is unfounded, then this faith is not only a baseless fancy, which we may discard without serious consequences. Faith in the risen Christ is a matter of vital importance, on which the whole structure of Christian life and practice, Christian assurance, Christian hope for time and eternity, is founded and with the collapse of which Christianity collapses. "Vain is your faith!" *Μάταιος*, differing from *κενός*, describes faith as ineffectual, lacking power, devoid of result.

Your faith, just because it is empty, without a real object, cannot help, cannot deliver, cannot save you, just as little as the firm belief that a counterfeit dollar is legal currency will help the owner, will buy the object desired.

In order to show the utter uselessness of Christian faith without the risen Christ, the Apostle names three items, each one of utmost importance. You are yet in your sins! Your dead fellow Christians are lost! You are of all men the most miserable!

Ye are yet in your sins! Deliverance from sin, redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sin, that was the glorious boon promised to all men in Christ Jesus. Yet that was a vain promise if Christ had not risen. Christ had been pointed out as the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. Already in the word of prophecy the Messiah was foretold as the Servant of God on whom the Lord hath laid the iniquity of all, Is. 53:6. Had Jesus of Nazareth remained in the grave, then that would have been proof conclusive that sin still held Him captive; that He had not been able to break the power of sin to condemn to death and corruption all those numbered with the transgressors; that even Christ, who, knowing no sin, was made sin for us, could not by His holy life and innocent suffering and death atone for sin, expiate its guilt, procure for all mankind justification, forgiveness, righteousness, without which no man shall see the Lord. For, while Christ died for our sins, it is only by His resurrection that we are justified. A mere man cannot save himself, cannot possibly save others from sin. Ps. 49:7, 8. And had Christ died and remained dead, that fact would have proved him beyond the possibility of refutation a mere man. He upon whom our faith and hope of eternal life rests, would himself be a mortal man, unfit to be our Savior from sin, lacking the most essential qualification of a Redeemer of mankind, Deity. It was the Man the Lord in whom Eve trusted; it was the Lord to whom Jacob turned in expectation of salvation; it was Immanuel, God with us, who was to be born of the Virgin that He might save His people from their sin. If Christ is not risen, if Christ remained in His grave, He was a mere man, and then we are yet in our sins. Not a single farthing of our debt is paid! The praying of the Fifth Petition — empty babbling! That entire awful burden of our sin still lying on our conscience! That dreadful guilt amassed by our transgressions still crying out against us before the judgment throne of the Holy One! Not a single moment of that eternal damnation awaiting every sinner canceled! For we are yet in our sin, hopelessly, helplessly, forever and ever held in its fetters, if Christ is not raised; and Christ is not raised if the dead are not raised!

And even that is not all. "Then they also which are fallen

asleep in Christ are perished," v. 18. "Then," ἄρα, again emphasizes that the statement introduced is a necessary corollary of what has been said. If Christ is not raised, if therefore the Christian's faith is in vain, if on that account the Christian is still in his sins, then it is a matter of course that all Christians that have died in the faith of Christ are lost. Paul uses the term κοιμηθέντες, those fallen asleep. Throughout the New Testament this term is used exclusively of such as have died in the faith of Christ, to whom death is indeed made a sleep and the grave a resting chamber, since in life and death they were united with the risen Christ, in death and in the grave the Lord's own. Rom. 14:8, 9. But how could Christ be the Lord of the living and of the dead, how could He save from eternal death those who were united with Him in their life and their death, if He Himself had remained in death? Then they would be united not with a living Christ, but with a dead person and, like Him, be doomed to the same fate that overcame the Champion of their cause, death and destruction. Lost! Ἀπόλοντο. That would be the dreadful sentence imposed upon them in spite of their faith in Christ. Lost, perished, of course, does not mean annihilation. They are lost as such as are still in their sins, and the penalty of sin is not annihilation. That would be far preferable to their actual fate, that of being cast into hell, where their worm dieth not, Is. 66:24; Mark 9:43-48; Matt. 25:46; Rev. 14:11. Those fallen asleep in Christ include not only the martyrs, as Chrysostom, Grotius, and others hold, nor only the New Testament believers, as many of the modern commentators assert. We see no reason why Paul, who wrote Rom. 3:21-25; 4:1-25; Gal. 3:5-18, did not include the Old Testament believers, since they also had placed their trust and hope in life and in death in the Christ, the Messiah, promised to them in ever-increasing clarity from Gen. 3:15 to Mal. 3 and 4.

All that have fallen asleep in Christ lost! Jacob, cp. Gen. 48:16; 49:18; Job, chap. 19:25-27; David, Ps. 14:7; Simeon, Luke 2:28-32; Stephen, Acts 7:58; Paul, 2 Tim. 4:7, 8, lost, every one of them! Our parents, who lived and died in Christ and brought us up in the fear and admonition of the same Lord, lost! Our spouse, fallen asleep after a life of exemplary Christianity, lost! That child committed to the Friend of children in Holy Baptism and gone to meet Him in heaven, lost! All, all, that fell asleep in Christ lost, eternally lost, because they still were in their sins, for their faith in Jesus as the Savior from sin was vain, futile, since Jesus was not raised from the dead, since the Christ on whom they pinned their faith was dead, buried, lost!

How gloomy a darkness! How hopeless an outlook! How miserable all that trust in Jesus Christ! That is the next thought brought out by the Apostle.

"If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable," v. 19. In the original, "only," μόνον, is placed at the end of the conditional clause, modifying the entire statement. The sense is, If that is the only thing that can be predicated of us that we are in this life such as have come to hope in Christ and are continuing in this hope, then are we most miserable. To have come to hope in Christ, to live with Him in intimate communion and in the sure hope of life everlasting, is the highest joy, the purest bliss of which man is capable in this life. That does not mean that the life of a Christian is one constant round of joy and pleasure as the world and the flesh of the believer count pleasure. "In the world ye shall have tribulation," says Christ. The life of the Christian is a constant battle against the enemies of his salvation, a constant crucifying of his flesh, 1 Cor. 9:26, 27; Gal. 5:24; 6:14. This conflict is waged not only by our soul; also our body suffers in consequence of it; it suffers together with the soul. The Christian is affected by the anguish caused by insults, shame, dishonor, heaped upon him for Christ's sake, by the agony of an awakened conscience, roused by his deeper recognition of his sinful depravity. Paul after describing this conflict, Rom. 7:14-23, breaks forth in that anguished cry, O wretched man that I am! Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? And he finds comfort and reason to thank God only through Jesus Christ, his Lord.

So the Christian throughout his struggles and conflicts is buoyed up and comforted by his hope in Christ, the hope of a glory to be revealed in us when on the Last Day the trump shall sound and we shall be raised incorruptible, 1 Cor. 15:52. On that day we shall enter upon our inheritance incorruptible and undefiled and that fadeth not away, 1 Pet. 1:4; cp. Job 19:25-27; Phil. 3:21; 1 Thess. 4:16, 17. That is the hope, centered in the risen Christ, sustaining, comforting, strengthening the Christians on their journey through life.

Now, if the dead are not raised, then Christ, on whom we base our hope of future life and glory, is not raised. Then He is the victim of death and corruption. Then it is impossible that He should be able to give to others life and glory which He Himself failed to obtain. Then our hope in Christ ends with our life. The Christian's expectation of unending joy in the company of Him whom we loved though we saw Him not—nothing but a pleasant daydream! The Christian's assurance that, having fallen asleep in Christ, he has finally entered peace and shall rest in his bed till the grand day of resurrection—an illusion! The weary child of God lies down to his last sleep in calm confidence that at last he has forever escaped the rage and fury of the roaring

lion seeking whom he may devour, and the savage bear thirsting for the Christians' blood, and lo! even his last home on earth is not the place of rest he had hoped for; but there he will be bitten by the serpent, stung with the sting of eternal death and damnation. (Cp. Amos 5:19.) What bitter disappointment! What blackest despair! The Christian's lifelong battle in vain! The crucifixion of his flesh useless agony! His daily sorrow for sin, his constant struggle against temptation, his ever-repeated denial of himself, all needless labor and anguish, because all was barren of the desired result! If Christ be not risen, it would be far better to make the most of life and the opportunities for enjoyment and pleasure it may offer than to deny oneself its pleasures in the vain and futile hope of a life to come. The traveler in the desert without water is sure to perish, and perish miserably, tortured by one of the most agonizing forms of death, that of death by thirst. Yet far more miserable will that traveler be when he sees in the distance a green oasis with palm trees raising their heads high in the air, promising refreshing shade and an abundant supply of life-giving water, inviting the wearied, famishing traveler to hurry on his way, urging him to exert all his waning strength to reach the fountain, only to see the *fata morgana* vanish in thin air, only to have all his hopes dashed to the ground, only to perish in agonized despair. That would be the fate of every one trusting in Christ as his Savior from death and damnation. Of all men he would be the most miserable if Christ be not risen!

In vv. 12-19 Paul has shown the dire consequences of a denial of a resurrection of the dead. Twice he has reminded his readers of the indisputable fact that, if dead rise not, neither is Christ risen. He has added to each statement a detailed picture of the utter hopelessness and vanity of a Christianity without a risen Christ. Unreal our message; unreal your faith; we preachers of the risen Christ false witnesses against God, vv. 14, 15; futile your faith; you are yet in your sins; your dead are lost; the living are of all men most miserable, vv. 17-19. These inevitable conclusions ought to be sufficient to convince every Christian of the insidious, soul-destroying character of doubt concerning the resurrection of the body. The Apostle, however, not only advances negative arguments against this vicious error. In triumphant assurance he brings out the positive facts which give the deathblow to any denial of resurrection. This he does in the next paragraph, vv. 20-34, of which the opening verse is the fitting close and climax of the Easter pericope.

"But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the First-fruits of them that slept." V. 20.

But, *δέ*, retains here its full adversative, antithetic force. Over

against the hopeless outlook pictured vv. 13-19, the very opposite is now introduced as a glorious fact. Now, *vuví*, does not denote time here, but is used in its logical and emotional sense "as the case really stands," "as it cannot be otherwise," cp. the proof vv. 1-11. Now is Christ raised! The perfect is used, has been raised, not to die again, like the youth of Nain, the daughter of Jairus, Lazarus, etc. No; He has been raised, and the consequences and effects of His raising continue both with regard to His own person (cp. Is. 53:10; Rom. 6:9,10; Heb. 7:23; Rev. 1:18) and to all His believing followers, as the Apostle points out in the following context.

Very emphatically and significantly the Apostle repeats "from the dead," *ἐκ νεκρῶν*, from among *dead*. On that memorable Good Friday, Christ the Lord had not fallen into a deathlike trance, into a cataleptic stupor. No; He had died. He had been numbered with dead men, and from dead He had been raised. The living God (Deut. 32:40), with whom is the fountain of life (Ps. 36:9), whose power is great and whose understanding is infinite (Ps. 147:5), with whom nothing shall be impossible (Luke 1:37), actually has done what human unbelief sneeringly declares impossible. By the omnipotence of God, Jesus was raised from the dead, and eternal Truth and Justice declared this Nazarene to be the Son of God, Rom. 1:4, both Lord and Christ, Acts 2:36. Cp. Is. 42:8. By raising Jesus from the dead the Judge of all the world solemnly announced His satisfaction with the redemptive work of this Christ, His reconciliation with the world, and His justifying decree embracing all mankind; Rom. 4:24, 25; 5:12-21; 2 Cor. 5:18-21.

Now is Christ raised from the dead. Here is God's own irrefutable, joyous fact against man's doubt and despair; the miracle of the Omnipotent against the cavils and sophistries of puny mortals; the yea and amen of the Eternal against man's disbelief and ridicule. Now is Christ raised from the dead!

One more thought is added: "And become the Firstfruits of them that slept." The verb "become" is evidently a later addition, found in none of the best manuscripts. The phrase is added as an apposition to "Christ." Christ was raised as the Firstfruits of "them that slept," the believers who have fallen asleep in the faith of Jesus. The article "them that," *τῶν*, is generic, comprehending the whole class of such as died in unbelief. In the class of "them that have fallen asleep" belong all that have died in the faith of Jesus in the Old Testament as well as in the New. The perfect tense does not limit the sleepers to such as had died before Christ's resurrection or before the time that the letter was written. Since the resurrection of the dead will take place on the Last Day, all those that have fallen asleep in Christ before that day are included.

For those living to see that day there will be no resurrection, but a change. 1 Cor. 15:51-53; 1 Thess. 4:13-17.

This resurrection of the dead saints is an assured fact, guaranteed to us by God Himself. When Christ was raised from the dead by the omnipotence of God, He was raised as the "Firstfruits" of them that have fallen asleep. This expression is taken from the Old Testament sacrificial ritual. Cp. particularly Lev. 23:9-21; Num. 15:17-21 and, in the New Testament, Rom. 8:23; 11:16; 1 Cor. 15:23; etc. Before the Israelites were permitted to eat of the harvest, they were to offer the firstfruits of the harvest to the Lord. By this offering of the firstfruits and of part of the first dough prepared from the newly harvested grain, the whole harvest and all their bread was hallowed to the Lord (cp. Rom. 11:16), taken out of the realm of profane food and placed into the realm of consecrated food, suitable for a consecrated people, hallowed meat for a hallowed nation (cp. the analogy of clean and unclean animals, Lev. 11:44-47). So Christ was raised as a firstfruit and thereby declared God's own Son, the Holy One, worthy to be received into eternal life and glory. If the firstfruit is holy, then the whole harvest is holy, consecrated to the Lord and fit for food. If Christ's body is raised as the Lord's own to enter into that state of glory which was His before the world began, then the whole harvest, the entire multitude of sheaves, the whole number of believers, which He represents, shall, like Him, be raised to everlasting life and unending glory according to His demand, John 17:24, and His promise, John 10:27-29; 11:25, 26. The firstfruits in Israel were only sheaves of grain, products of the earth, with no inherent power to actually effect the consecration they symbolized. Christ in a far higher and nobler sense is a Firstfruit. He is not only of the earth, earthy; He is the Lord from heaven, 1 Cor. 15:47. He remained the Son of God even when His body lay dead in the grave. He consecrated at His resurrection not sheaves of grain, but His own body, in which dwelt the fulness of the Godhead. And therefore He could be Firstfruits of *all* that had fallen asleep. On the harvest fields of Israel some sheaves of the harvest were lost in spite of the care taken by the harvesters and the diligent search of the gleaners. There is no danger that any one blade of that huge harvest of believers will be lost or overlooked on the final resurrection day. He, the Son of God, has the power to raise all, and He, the loving Savior, will do what He promised and guaranteed by His resurrection. He watches over the graves of those whom He acknowledged as His own. In His sight they are priceless treasures, bought with His own blood. Carefully He watches over every particle of dust into which their bodies gradually dissolve, and on the Last Day He will gather all these par-

ticles and reunite them as a glorified body with their soul, which had awaited this happy day. As there was nothing to prevent the harvest to be eaten after the firstfruits were hallowed, so there is nothing in heaven or hell that will prevent the harvest of all of those who have fallen asleep, their being raised like Him from death and the grave in a resurrection as different from the resurrection of the other dead as heaven differs from hell, as life everlasting differs from eternal death. Luther writes: "The word 'Firstfruits' teaches us that Christ is not the only one, that others will follow. You must not regard this man as one who has risen for himself only; for then His resurrection would be a sorry consolation and would profit us no more than if He had never become man. . . . When Paul calls Christ the Firstfruits, he indicates that we should view the resurrection as an act which has already begun in Christ, yea, that is more than half completed. What is left of death is to be regarded as only a deep sleep. The future resurrection of our body will be nothing more than a sudden awakening out of such sleep. The chief and best part has been accomplished by the resurrection of Christ, our Head. If the Head sits above and lives, there is no more danger, no more need of fear; we who cling to Him must follow as His body and members. . . . No matter when or how we shall die, whether it be in bed or in fire or in water or by the rope or the sword, Satan, the lord of death, the master slaughterer, will do his job of slaying us well enough, so that there will be no need of our choosing any particular form of death. But no matter how he executes us, we shall not be harmed. He may give us a bitter draught, as it is given to those who should be put to sleep so that they no longer feel anything. Yet we shall again awake and arise on that day at the sound of the trump. That Satan cannot prevent, because we are now already in Christ more than half out of death, and Satan cannot keep our poor, miserable body, though it is food for worms." (Luther, St. L., VIII: 1148—50.)

Modern unbelief, though cloaked in the garment of Christianity, still asserts that there is no resurrection of the dead, that Christ lives only in His message, in His spirit, etc. The preacher may choose as his theme *The Folly of Denying the Resurrection of the Body*. He may follow the argumentation of the Apostle and show that such denial is a negation of Christ's resurrection; empties Christian preaching; makes Christian faith baseless; blasphemes God; robs faith of its saving power; robs us of forgiveness; deprives us of eternal life; makes us miserable men. And then the grand climax, v. 20. — *The Glory of Christ's Resurrection*. It is an established fact; it is the foundation of our faith; it is the guarantee

of our hope. — *Now is Christ Risen!* In Him we have for empty philosophy a sure Gospel; for earthly helpers a divine Redeemer; for woeful misery heavenly joy; for fear of death a glorious hope. — *Let Us Thank God for the Easter Message!* It assures us of the Deity of Christ. It certifies to us our redemption. It guarantees to us our resurrection. — Vv. 17-20. *The Glorious Light of Easter Morning.* It dispels the darkness of sin, v. 17. The clouds of adversity cannot obscure it, v. 19. It changes the night of death into the day of life.

TH. LAETSCH

Luther: A Blessing to the English

VII. Dr. Robert Barnes in Trouble

On the Fourth Sunday in Advent, December 24, 1525, Hugh Latimer preached in the Augustinian chapel, and so Prior Barnes preached in St. Edward's Church and used Luther's sermon on Philippians 4:4.

He denounced the observance of holy days, the temporal possessions and the secular jurisdiction of the Church, the extravagance of Wolsey. The only apostle followed by the bishops was Judas; the only prophet Balaam. Holy orders, church hallowings, and pardons were sold "as openly as a cow and an ass." Paul taught no bishop should be bishop of more than one city. He did not pray to Our Lady, nor for the souls in purgatory. It was not right for Christians to sue one another.

To the last remark he was roused by a clergyman who had just sued a person too poor to pay a vow made to the Church. And that greedy scoundrel sat brazenly in the congregation! And the preacher supported himself by St. Paul, Athanasius, and Jerome. Fox writes: "He so postilled the whole epistle following the Scripture and Luther's postil, that for that sermon he was immediately accused of heresy." Bitter enemies in the audience lodged twenty-five heresies against the bold preacher with Vice-Chancellor Edmund Natares, or Nottoris, also a personal enemy.

The prior had to face Natares, Ridley, Watson, Preston, Fooke, and Tyrell.

Would he submit himself? was the peremptory demand of the Vice-Chancellor.

He would recall anything contrary to the Word of God, or to St. Augustine, St. James, or of "the four holy doctors."

"Or to the laws of the Church," added Ridley and Preston. To this he demurred; not being a doctor of the law, he knew not what was included in that phrase.

Thundering at the door, students demanding admittance. The bedell could not quiet them, neither the Vice-Chancellor, though "he gave them good and fair words." "They said it appertained to learning, and they were the body of the university." The hearing had to be adjourned.

Within a few days the same authorities called Barnes for a further cross-examination. Again a demonstration by the university put a stop to the proceedings.

After a month Watson and Preston asked Barnes to sign on the dotted line a revocation. After consulting with eight friends, among them Bilney and Stafford, he made a formal refusal. The Lutheran doctrines were discussed with great heat, "one preaching against another."

Six days before Shrovetide Cardinal Wolsey sent Chaplain Capon and Master Gibson, a sergeant at arms, to make a strict search for Lutheran books. President Dr. Thomas Forman of Queens' tipped off his thirty friends. The inquisitors ripped up planks and examined walls in the various colleges, but they found no Lutheran books!

On February 6 Barnes was arrested and taken to Cardinal Wolsey at Windsor.

Coverdale escaped a personal accusation and with two other friends went with Barnes to help draw up his defense. "Now I begin to taste of Holy Scriptures."

Stephen Gardiner writes: "Barnes, whom I knewe fyrst at Cambridge, a trymme minion frere Augustine, one of a merye skoffynge witte frerelike, and as a good felowe in company was beloved of many, a doctor of divinitie he was, but never like to have proved to be either martyre or confessor in Christes religion, and yet he began there to exercise raylinege (which amonge such as newly profess Christ, is a great pece of connyng, and a great forwardness to reputation, especialle, if he rayle of Byshops as Barnes began, and to please suche of the lower sort as envieth ever auctoritie) cheflye againste my lorde Cardinall, then, under the Kinges maiesty, having the high administration of the realme." . . . At the time of this accusation of Barnes, I was in service with my Lord Cardinal, of acquaintance with Barnes, and not accompted his enemy, and yet I thank God I never favored such strange opinions as he and some other wantonly began to set forth; but because there was not in them malice, and they maintained communication having some savor of learning, I was familiar with such sort of men, and was then sorry for Barnes, and glad to help him, so far as might stand with my duty to my Lord, my master."

Wednesday evening, February 7, Barnes was led by his friends

Gardiner and Edward Fox to the Cardinal, and a memorable conversation followed.

"Were it better for me, being in the honor and dignity that I am, to coin my pillars and pole axes and to give the money to five or six beggars that will soon . . . them out against the wall, than for to maintain the commonwealth by them as I do? Do you not reckon the commonwealth better than five or six beggars?"

Barnes manfully held his ground and held the coining of them might be for the salvation of the Cardinal's soul, and as for the commonwealth, he sensibly said it "did not hang on them, for as his Grace knew, the commonwealth was before his Grace and must be when his Grace is gone. Alonely, I damned in my sermon the gorgeous pomp and pride of all exterior ornaments."

"Will you be ruled by us, and we will do all things for your honesty and for the honesty of your university."

"I thank your Grace for your good will. I will stick to the Holy Scriptures and to God's book, according to the simple talent that God hath lent me."

"Well, thou shalt have thy learning tried to the uttermost, and thou shalt have the law." Forthwith he should have gone to prison in the Tower but that Gardiner and Fox became his sureties that night.

Gardiner, who knew, says "that railing in a friar had been easily pardoned if Barnes had not fondly persisted in the Anabaptists' opinion denying suits to be lawful among Christian men." The Cardinal said: "Barnes began at the lewdest opinion of the Anabaptists, whereby to extinct the orders of justice."

The next day came the public examination before six bishops and other doctors. The first article charged Barnes with contempt for the observance of holy days. Chancellor John Fisher "would not condemn it as heresy for a hundred pounds; but it was a foolish thing to preach this before all the butchers of Cambridge."

John Clerk, recently made bishop of Bath and Wells, for services against the Lutheran party, was not disposed to mercy, and pressed more than one point with vindictive unfairness against the accused. For three days the "able disputant" defended himself with Augustine and the Bible. On Saturday John Clerk at last bade him turn or burn.

"Jesus have mercy on me; I will surely not read it" — the revocation. He would burn rather than turn.

Gardiner and Fox begged him to recant. "By reason of their good words and piteous I granted to read the roll. Then was all the people that stode ther, called to hear me. For in the other three dayes, was there no man suffered to here one worde that I spake. . . . After this I was commanded to subscribe it, and to make a

crosse on it. Than was I commanded to goe knel downe before the byshop of Bathe, and to require absolucion of hym, but he wolde not assoyle me, except I wold first swere that I wolde fulfyll the penaunce that he shuld enjoyne to me. So did I swere, . . . and the nexte day, which was fastyngame Sunday, I shuld do open penaunce at Poules." He had company.

As early as 1250 the German Hanse merchants settled in Thames Street, the old Roman wall, at Dowgate, the western end of Caesar's London. Their large stone house was called Guilda Aula Theutonicorum, commonly the Steelyard, Stahlfhof, and lay between All Hallows Lane and Cousin Lane.

In 1259, Richard, Earl of Cornwall, the only Englishman to be Kaiser of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation, and brother-in-law of Kaiser Frederick II, got his brother, King Henry III, to grant special privileges to these German merchants. Old Stow tells they traded in "Wheat, Rye, and other Grain, Cables, Ropes, Masts, Pitch, Tar, Flax, Hemp, Linen Cloth, Wainscots, Wax, Steel, and other profitable Merchandises." They also ran the Rhenish Wine House, noted by good old Samuel Pepys.

"The Steelyard merchants advanced loans to our kings, and were always found to be available for national emergencies." Hans Holbein's Triumphs of Riches and Poverty gave charm to the walls. His portrait of one of these merchants, George Gyze, is described by John Ruskin in language quite lyrical.

The Steelyard has been replaced by the Cannon Street Station.

Some of these merchants attended All Hallows the More or Great, south of Thames Street, and presented the great altar screen and all the other fine wood carvings. The pulpit was surrounded by the eagle of the Hansa.

Stow tells us: "Near to the Standard in Cheap, is Honeylane, so called, not of the Sweetness thereof, being very narrow, and somewhat dark, but rather of often Washing and Sweeping to keep it clean. In this lane is the small Parish Church of Alhallow's [the Less]. There was a Parsonage House." Since Feb. 7, 1524, the parson was Dr. Thomas Forman, one of the "German Lutherans" of Cambridge, D. D. in 1524.

His curate was Thomas Garret, a fellow of Oxford, to whom Erasmus by Robert Aldridge at Christmas 1525 sent greetings as a "bookseller."

When some of these German merchants quit going to mass, Cardinal Wolsey sent Bishop John Clerk of Bath, Stephen Gardiner, now archdeacon of Taunton, and others to examine them on February 8, 1526.

Hans Ellerdorpe has been here for a year and a quarter. Found a book of Luther's in a chamber of one of his master's

agents, on whose death he took possession of all his master's goods, did not burn it because it was not his own, did not read a whole page of it.

Helbert Bellendorpe came in 1511; about a year ago he had some of Luther's German books, viz., *De Captivitate*, *De Castitate*, &c. Read a few pages of the former, and a third part of the latter, and burned them shortly after Christmas last. About Whitsuntide last, when he returned from Germany, he brought with him three German books, two of them Luther's and one of Carolus Stadius [Carlstadt]; also a New Testament in German, knows not whose translation, and the five Books of Moses, which he says are Luther's. He lent some dialogues and a book of Stadius to George Van Telight. Was in London when Luther's books were burned in St. Paul's churchyard. Has eaten flesh on three prohibited days.

Hans Reussel has been in England fourteen months, before that time six months in Estlande, where he was born, formerly in England one and a half years. When last in Estlande read some books and sermons of Martin Luther. Remembers the name of one, *De Libertate Christianitatis*. Had seen, even then, Luther's book against the king of England, in German, but had read nothing in it, except the letter at the beginning. About half a year ago Helbert Bellonder told him of news from beyond sea; which on desiring to hear, he lent him a book that Luther had written against Carolus Stadius, in German, which he kept for a month, and read through. When Hermann Van Holt was sent to the Tower, deponent burned this book. During the time he has been in England this last time, he has had the Five Books of Moses and the New Testament in Luther's German translation, and read them often, but not all through. Had a treatise on the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of Faith, and the Ten Commandments, composed by Luther in German. Was pleased with Luther's books. Thinks the Pope is on a level with other bishops; heard this in sermons in his own country, and also in general conversation. Now he believes as the Church believes, and acknowledges the Pope, with all Christians, to be the Church. Ate flesh only once on Friday at Gregory's house.

Henry Pryknes confesses in presence of the lord Legate he has been in England upward of two years and a half. About Michaelmas past the purser of a ship dropped in his chamber a little book in German, which he identified in court, entitled *Opera quaedam Martini Lutheri*, in which he read a treatise upon the Lord's Prayer. Had not heard of the burning or condemnation of Luther's books until the feast of All Saints last, when he heard say that all Luther's adherents, and those who possessed his books,

were excommunicated. Submits himself to correction. All four were taken to the Fleet prison.

On February 11, 1526, Shrove Sunday, a procession moves from the Fleet. The warden, the knight marshal, the tipstaffs, and "all the company they could make, with bills and glaives"; in the midst of these armed officials, six men in penitential dress, one carrying a lighted taper five pounds' weight, the others with fagots, signifying the fate their crimes had deserved, but this time mercifully remitted. Who are they? Dr. Robert Barnes and the four "Stillyard men."

Amid crowds they come to St. Paul's Cathedral at eight o'clock. Dean Richard Pace receives them. The public seats are filled.

On a platform in the center of the nave, enthroned in pomp of purple and gold and splendor, sits "the other king," the great Cardinal Wolsey, "euen like a bloudy Antichrist," supported on each side with eighteen bishops, mitred abbots, and priors—six and thirty in all; his chaplains and spiritual doctors in gowns of damask and satin.

Opposite the platform over the north door is the Rood of Northen, a famous image, a great crucifix; and at the foot of it, inside a rail, a fire is burning, with the sinful books of Luther ranged around it in baskets, waiting for the execution of the sentence.

On a second platform in front of the Cardinal's throne the six men are kneeling, their fagots on their shoulders, begging pardon of God and the Holy Catholic Church for their high crimes. After this confession Bishop John Fisher of Rochester preaches from Luke 18:24, the lesson for Quinquagesima, "Against Luther and Dr. Barnes." "To all them that be not ouer peruersedly drowned in the heresies of Luther it shall appare (as I verily suppose) that his doctryne is veray pestilent and pernicious."

Barnes says, "All his sermon was agaynst Lutherians." And during all the long sermon the five heretics had to kneel.

Then Barnes tells the people "he was more charitably handled than he deserved, his heresies were so heinous and detestable."

The knight marshal leads the prisoners three times round the blazing pile, casting in their fagots as they passed. The books in the baskets are heaped on the fagots, and the holocaust is complete. Fisher pronounces the prisoners absolved and received back into Communion.

The Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London says Barnes and the other men "shulde a stonde at Powlles crosse at the sermonde with faggots and tapers, but for because of rayne they stode on the hye scaffolds within the church."

Barnes was a prisoner in the Fleet for half a year and then "a free prisoner" of the "Austyne freers," where Broad Street falls into Throgmorton Street. In 1550 Edward VI gave their church to "the Dutch nation in London."

On fresh complaint he was sent to Northampton. Once more he was in danger of burning as a relapsed heretic, having sold New Testaments to two countrymen from Essex who had come for them to London. The Chronicle says, "he brake away from them and went beyend see unto Luter—" after two and three quarters of a year in prison.

Oak Park, Ill.

WM. DALLMANN

Die Taufe Johannis des Täufers in ihrem Verhältnis zu Christi Taufe

Ein Gegenstand der Heiligen Schrift, der in seinem vollen Zusammenhang weniger in unsern Schriften behandelt worden ist, ist der von der Taufe des Johannes in ihrem Verhältnis zu Christi Taufe. Und doch ist dieser Gegenstand von großer Wichtigkeit und Bedeutung für die Stärkung unsers Glaubens und den kräftigen Trost unserer Taufe. Auch geht aus Aussprachen auf unsern Konferenzen und aus einigen unserer Schriften hervor, daß nicht bei allen das rechte Verständnis und völlige Klarheit über dieses Verhältnis vorhanden ist. Und so möge denn dieser Gegenstand von des Johannes Taufe in ihrem Verhältnis zu Christi Taufe aus der Schrift ganz schlicht und einfach möglichst kurz dargelegt werden.

Es wird gut sein und zugleich mehr Interesse für diesen Gegenstand erwecken, wenn wir uns auf dem Gebiet unserer lutherischen Schriften etwas umsehen und die Stellung beachten, welche unsere Lehrer in dieser Sache einnehmen.

Die lutherischen Theologen lehren im allgemeinen, daß kein wesentlicher Unterschied zwischen Christi Taufe und der Taufe des Johannes bestehe; jedoch erklären sie, daß ein gewisser Unterschied da sei, und führen einen solchen in ihren Schriften an.

In einem neueren lutherischen Kommentar heißt es: "It must be noted, on the one hand, that there are many points of agreement. John baptized by divine command, Luke 3:2, 3; John 1:33; Matt. 21:25; Luke 7:30. His was a baptism in and with water, Matt. 3:11, etc. It was, finally, a baptism unto repentance, for the forgiveness of sins, Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3. In all these features it agreed with the baptism of Christ."

Das ist der rechte schriftgemäße Stand der lutherischen Theologen zu Johannis Taufe. D. Pieper macht noch darauf aufmerksam, daß auch die älteren lutherischen Theologen, wie Martin Chemnitz, Johann

Gerhard und Egidius Hunnius, denselben Standpunkt einnahmen (Christl. Dogmatik III, 338). Es ist damit ausgesagt, daß die Taufe Johannis Vergebung der Sünden, den Heiligen Geist und auch die ewige Seligkeit darreichte und mittheilte. — Aber wie kommt es dann, daß man dennoch fast durchweg einen gewissen Unterschied zwischen Christi und Johannis Taufe setzt und festhält? Der Hauptgrund ist offenbar der, daß man dadurch die Stelle Apost. 19, 1—7 mit den andern Stellen von der heiligen Taufe in Einklang bringen und erklären will. In jener Stelle wird uns nämlich berichtet, daß Paulus zu Ephesus „etliche Jünger“ fand, die, wie sie sagten, „auf Johannis Taufe“ getauft waren, und die dann Paulus wieder taufte „auf den Namen des Herrn Jesu“. Daraus urtheilt man, so muß die Taufe des Johannes von Jesu Taufe verschieden und nach Pfingsten ungültig und außer Kraft gesetzt gewesen sein. — Aber die rechte, schriftgemäße Auslegung jener Stelle Apost. 19 ist ohne Zweifel die, welche D. Stöckhardt in seiner „Biblischen Geschichte des Neuen Testaments“, S. 387, darlegt. Er schreibt: „Wir müssen zwischen der Taufe, die Johannes selbst vollzog, und der Taufe der späteren Johannisjünger, welche auch kurzweg Johannistaufe genannt wurde *), unterscheiden. Die Taufe, mit welcher Johannes taufte auf ausdrücklichen Befehl Gottes, war ein gültiges, kräftiges Sakrament, welches denen, die ihre Sünden bekannten und der Predigt Johannis glaubten, Gnade und Vergebung der Sünden mittheilte. . . . Nicht alle Johannisjünger waren aber in die Nachfolge Jesu übergegangen. So finden wir auch nach Johannis und Christi Tod, nach Pfingsten noch eine besondere Gemeinschaft von Johannisjüngern, welche sich von der christlichen Kirche fernhielt. Die bildeten eine Sekte, verehrten Johannes als Sektenhaupt und handelten damit dem Willen und der Weisung ihres eigenen Meisters zuwider. Und so war die Taufe, die sie vollzogen und für Fortsetzung der Taufe Johannis ausgaben, keine rechte Taufe. . . . Die Taufe Johannis war jetzt in die christliche Taufe übergegangen. Und eben diese Johannistaufe der späteren Johannisjünger, die in Wahrheit keine Taufe war, hatten die zwölf Jünger, von denen hier die Rede ist, empfangen.“ Und darum wurden sie hier von Paulus erst mit der rechten Taufe auf den Namen Jesu Christi getauft. So führt D. Stöckhardt das aus. — Und D. Prehmann legt diese ganze Erklärung in *Popular Commentary*, S. 630, im Englischen kräftig dar und begründet diese Auslegung S. 629 als die richtige, indem er schreibt: „Both for grammatical and historical reasons verse 5 cannot be regarded as belonging to Paul's words.“

Aber dennoch werden, wie gesagt, vielfach gewisse, und wie uns scheint, manchmal etwas dunkle, Unterschiede zwischen Christi Taufe und Johannis rechter Taufe gesetzt. Die Bibelstellen, aus welchen die Ausleger ihre Unterschiede entnehmen, sind neben Apost. 19, 1—7 die

*) Wie Apost. 18, 25.

folgenden drei: „Ich taufe euch mit Wasser, aber er wird euch mit dem Heiligen Geist taufen“; „Johannes hat getauft mit der Taufe der Buße“; und der Ausdruck „der nach mir kommt“. Sehen wir uns diese Stellen näher an.

Nehmen wir Joh. 1, 25—27. Da ist der Täufer über seiner Taufe angegriffen: wie er taufen dürfe, wenn er nicht Christus sei. Johannes antwortet: „Ich taufe mit Wasser; aber er ist mitten unter euch getreten, den ihr nicht kennet. Der ist's, der nach mir kommen wird“ usw. Das ist nicht gleichsam eine schüchterne, ausweichende Erklärung: Ach, ich taufe ja nur mit Wasser. Meine Taufe hat nicht viel auf sich. Die ist eigentlich keine Neuerung. So braucht ihr euch nicht darüber aufzuregen. — Nein! Gerade das Gegenteil ist der Fall. Seine Taufe läßt er in ihrer ganzen Würde und Kraft als des Messias' Taufe stehen und verteidigt sie in aller ihrer göttlichen Hoheit und Herrlichkeit und Kraft, indem er sagt: „Aber er ist mitten unter euch getreten“; es ist nicht bloß ein armer Johannes, der hier tauft, der nicht wert ist, des Messias' Schuhriemen aufzulösen, sondern in mir und durch mich tauft der hohe und erhabene Messias, der Sohn Gottes selbst. Und er ist mitten unter euch getreten; er ist da und hat durch meine Taufe und Predigt das neutestamentliche Sakrament und den neuen Bund aufgerichtet und angefangen, Joh. 3, 5. — Man denke an Jesu Taufe, da er von Johannes getauft wurde. Seine Beschneidung war das alttestamentliche, seine Taufe aber nun schon das neutestamentliche Sakrament. Johannes will sagen, er ist mitten unter euch getreten und wird auch bald selber sein herrliches Amt antreten.

So sehen wir, wenn Johannes öfters sagt: „Ich taufe euch mit Wasser; der aber nach mir kommt, der wird euch mit dem Heiligen Geist taufen“, oder „mit dem Heiligen Geist und mit Feuer taufen“, so enthält das keine Schwierigkeit. Er will damit nicht sagen, daß seine Taufe nicht den Heiligen Geist gebe. Einmal sagt uns Johannes damit ausdrücklich, daß Gott zum Taufen Wasser zu gebrauchen eingesezt hat. Sodann zeigt er uns, der große Gegensatz, den er hiermit hoch hervorhebt, ist der: Ich, will Johannes sagen, taufe auf göttlichen Befehl und bin ein menschlicher Diener Gottes. Christus ist der Höhere, der Gottessohn, der einige Heilmittler, der die Vergebung der Sünden erwirkt und uns den Heiligen Geist aus eigener Macht mitteilt. Das ist der gewaltige Unterschied. Aber nirgends lehrt und sezt Johannes einen Unterschied zwischen seiner und Christi Taufe.

Auch die Stellen Matth. 3, 11 und Luk. 3, 16 bestätigen kräftig die Richtigkeit dieser Auslegung. In seiner tiefen Demut sagt Johannes da: „Ich taufe euch mit Wasser zur Buße; der aber nach mir kommt, ist stärker denn ich.“ Da weist er gleich an beiden Stellen auf die Person Jesu Christi hin und sagt: „Der ist stärker denn ich.“ Der ist der mächtige Messias. — Johannes hatte nämlich bei dem Volk viel gegen den Irrtum zu kämpfen, daß es ihn, Johannes, für den Messias

annehmen wollte, Joh. 3, 28. Da sind zum Verständnis unsers Gegenstandes die beiden Verse Luk. 3, 15. 16 im Zusammenhang wichtig. Vers 15 wird uns gesagt, daß „das Volk im Wahn war und dachten alle in ihren Herzen von Johanne, ob er vielleicht Christus wäre“. Und da „antwortete Johannes und sprach zu allen: Ich taufe euch mit Wasser; es kommt aber ein Stärkerer nach mir . . .; der wird euch mit dem Heiligen Geist und mit Feuer taufen“. Johannes redet also in diesen Worten nicht von einem Unterschied zwischen Taufen. Dazu war keine Veranlassung, und das hätte hier keinen Sinn, sondern er beteuerte dem Volk, daß nicht er, sondern der Stärkere, der nach ihm kommen werde, Christus, der mächtige Messias und Gottes Sohn sei.

Endlich soll uns auch die Stelle Apost. 1, 5 nicht irremachen, wo Christus selbst sagt: „Denn Johannes hat mit Wasser getauft; ihr aber sollt mit dem Heiligen Geist getauft werden nicht lange nach diesen Tagen.“ Christus setzt nämlich hier Johannis Taufe gar nicht in Gegensatz oder Vergleich zu seiner, zu Christi, Taufe, sondern zu der bevorstehenden Ausgießung des Heiligen Geistes über seine Jünger. Auch Petrus hat nach Pfingsten diese Stelle so verstanden. Apost. 11, 15. 16. — Warum Christus und Johannes so häufig Johannis Taufe mit Christi Ausgießung des Heiligen Geistes zusammenstellen, sagen sie uns nicht, und es wäre zwecklos, darüber allerlei Vermutungen auszusprechen.

Die Meinung, daß diese Schriftstellen dennoch zwischen den beiden Taufen einen wirklichen Unterschied machen, läßt sich nicht halten. Wollte man einen Unterschied machen wie zwischen einer bloßen Wassertaufe und einer Heiligen-Geist-Taufe (wie die Worte anzugeben scheinen), so widerspräche das allen jenen Stellen, die von Johannis Taufe ausdrücklich sagen, daß sie die Taufe „zur Vergebung der Sünden“ war (Mark. 1, 4; Luk. 3, 3) und also Vergebung der Sünden und den Heiligen Geist mitteilte, Joh. 3, 3. 5. So ist in diesem Stück kein Unterschied zwischen Christi Taufe und Johannis Taufe zu finden.

Auch der Synodalbericht des Minnesota-Distrikts vom Jahre 1912 kommt in bezug auf diesen Punkt zu demselben Resultat, das er in diesen trefflichen Worten darlegt: „Und wenn Johannes daher sagt, daß er mit Wasser taufe, Christus aber mit dem Heiligen Geist und Feuer taufen werde, so weist er damit hin nicht auf einen Unterschied in der Taufe, sondern auf einen Unterschied zwischen den tausenden Personen. Christus ist der Größere, der Stärkere, in dessen Hand Heil und Verderben, Leben und Tod liegt, in dessen Macht es steht, . . . den Gläubigen die Gabe des Geistes zu geben, den Ungläubigen dagegen Zorn und Gericht. Das ist eben bei Johannes nicht der Fall. Er kann wohl die Wassertaufe vollziehen, aber die Wirkung dieser Taufe liegt nur in Christi Hand, der ihr kann den Geist geben.“ So weit der Synodalbericht.

Eine weitere Frage bei diesem Gegenstand wäre: Warum heißt

die Taufe des Johannes so oft eine Taufe der Buße? Offenbar weil sie Buße, Sinnesänderung, voraussetzte und unbedingt Buße verlangte. Entweder Buße, auch „rechtschaffene Früchte der Buße“, oder keine Taufe! Matth. 3, 6 ff. D. P. E. Krehmann schreibt in seinem Kommentar, daß zur Zeit Johannis des Täuflers bei den Juden verschiedene religiöse Waschungen und besonders die Proselytentaufe in Gebrauch war. Da kommt Johannes mit seiner neuen Taufe und spricht: „Ich taufe euch mit der Taufe der Buße.“ Buße bedurfte das Volk, und Buße, Wegbereitung war das Hauptamt des Vorläufers; „Tut Buße!“ war sein erster Ruf, und so war „Bußtaufe“ ein ganz natürlicher, zutreffender Name.

Dieser Name braucht daher niemand zu befremden, als ob in demselben eine Andeutung wäre, daß diese Taufe von Christi Taufe verschieden sein müsse. Im Gegenteil, wir sehen, daß sie mit der Taufe der Apostel Jesu zu Pfingsten vollständig übereinstimmt. Vergleiche Apost. 2, 38 und Luk. 3, 3. Petrus predigte von Jesu, daß er Christus, der Welt Erlöser sei. Große Scharen erkennen nun ihre Sünde, werden an Jesum gläubig und fragen in großer Bekümmernis: „Ihr Männer, liebe Brüder, was sollen wir tun?“ Und das erste Wort, das Petrus ihnen zuruft, ist: „Tut Buße!“ „Tut Buße und lasse sich ein jeglicher taufen auf den Namen Jesu Christi zur Vergebung der Sünden.“ Das erste Erfordernis für Christi Taufe war also auch zu Pfingsten und ist heute noch: Tut Buße, das heißt: Glaube an Jesum Christum, den Sünderheiland, dann habt auch ihr teil an der Verheißung der Taufe, so werdet ihr Vergebung der Sünden und den Heiligen Geist empfangen. Das ist also genau wie bei der Taufe des Johannes.

Das Gesagte wird bestätigt durch Apost. 19, 4. Da belehrt Paulus jene späteren Johannisjünger, wie es Johannes bei seiner Taufe gehalten hat. Und da gibt Paulus der Taufe Johannis ein herrliches Zeugnis. Er beschreibt sie als die ordentliche von Gott eingesetzte Taufe des Neuen Testaments und stellt sie mit der Taufe der Apostel zu Pfingsten auf eine Stufe. „Johannes“, spricht er, „hat getauft mit der Taufe der Buße.“ „Und sagte dem Volk, daß sie sollten glauben an den, der nach ihm kommen sollte, das ist, an Jesum, daß er Christus sei.“ Das einzige Erfordernis seiner Taufe war somit der Glaube an Jesum Christum, der da kommen sollte. Wenn sie sich im Glauben auf den Namen dieses von ihm gepredigten Christus taufen ließen, dann hatten sie die Verheißung: So sollten sie durch die Taufe Vergebung ihrer Sünden und den Heiligen Geist empfangen, wie das auch Christus Joh. 3, 5 von Johannis Taufe bezeugt. „Die Taufe der Buße“ stimmt also vollkommen mit der Taufe Christi überein. Und auch ihr Name zeigt keinerlei Unterschied zwischen ihr und Christi Taufe an.

Interessant und auch erklärend ist, was Fehling, *Life of Christ*,

§. 136, berichtet: "So close was repentance connected in their thoughts with the advent of the Messiah that it was said in one of the Rabbinical traditions: 'If Israel repented but one day, the Son of David would immediately come.'" Ein Nachklang hierzu findet sich auch in der Schriftstelle Apost. 11, 18. Wo man da von den Christen etwa die Worte erwartet: So hat Gott den Heiden die Wundergaben des Heiligen Geistes gegeben, da rufen sie, Gott lobend, aus: „So hat Gott auch den Heiden Buße gegeben zum Leben!“ „Buße“ lebte in ihren Herzen und auf ihren Lippen.

So haben wir gesehen, aus den beiden Stellen „Ich taufe euch mit Wasser“ und „mit der Taufe der Buße“ darf und kann man einfach keinen Unterschied in Hinsicht auf Johannis Taufe finden und annehmen, oder man lehrt verkehrt.

Nun wäre unsers Wissens nur ein dritter Ausdruck übrig, nämlich „der nach mir kommen wird“, von welchem einige einen Unterschied herleiten. — Was die Zeit betrifft, gehört Johannes mit seiner Taufe und Predigt nach Christi Ausspruch Matth. 11, 9—15 ins Neue Testament. Hier wird er von Christo als der Vorläufer des Messias dargestellt, der seinen Herrn dem Volk vorstellt und ihn vor demselben ausruft. Luk. 1, 76, auch V. 17, heißt es genau: "For thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare His ways." Das Bild ist wohl das von einem Herold, der in der Gegenwart seines Königs, ihn auf einem stattlichen Roß führend, vor ihm herläuft und mit seinem Ausrufen ihn dem Volk vorstellt. Luther sagt zu obigem Ausspruch Christi: „Johannes ist der Gröfste gewesen unter allen . . .; das ist, er hat die gröfsten Dinge unter allen gepredigt, nämlich, daß Christus gegenwärtig sei.“ (VII: 122.) Auch der Inhalt der Predigt Johannis und der Predigt Christi wird in der Schrift als ganz gleich angegeben: „Zut Buße; das Himmelreich ist nahe herbeikommen“, Matth. 3, 2; 4, 17; Mark. 1, 15. Und A. Färling, *The Life of Christ*, rechnet mit sorgfältiger Genauigkeit heraus, daß Christus etwa nur vier Monate nach Johannes sein Amt angetreten hat. Es gehört Johannes mit seinem Amt ins Neue Testament und seine Taufe ist die neutestamentliche Taufe Gottes wie Christi Taufe. Luther schreibt: „Es ist Johannes der Ursprung des Neuen Testaments und macht's ein Ende mit dem Alten Testament.“ (VII: 1522.) Und abermals: „Das neue Reich sollte nun Johannes anfangen. . . . Der macht die Änderung. An ihm hört das Alte Testament auf und fähet sich das Neue an.“ (VII: 1577.)

Ein oft angeführter Unterschied, die Zeit betreffend, ist der, daß Jesu Taufe die Vergebung der Sünden darreicht als ein Gut, das bereits erworben ist, die Taufe Johannis aber hinweist auf die künftige Erwerbung dieses kostbaren Guts durch Christi Erlösung. So ist es. Johannes taufte auf Christi Tod und Auferstehung, die noch zukünftig waren, Christus aber durch seine Apostel nach Pfingsten auf seinen Tod und Auferstehung, die bereits geschehen waren. Der Grund der Taufe

ist somit in beiden Fällen derselbe: Christi Kreuzestod und Auferstehung. Was den Grund der Taufe betrifft, könnte Christi und Johannis Taufe eine sein, da der Grund einer ist. Nur dieses Zeitverhältnis, vor und nach Christi Tod, bleibt als Unterschied stehen. Doch ist dieser Unterschied von keiner großen Bedeutung, da Christus nicht bloß nach Pfingsten, sondern auch vor seinem Tode und seiner Auferstehung durch seine Apostel getauft hat, ebenso wie Johannes (Joh. 3, 22. 23), und dieser Zeitunterschied also zwischen Johannes und Christi Taufe einerseits und Christi nachpfingstlicher Taufe andererseits besteht.

Aus dem benannten Ausdruck und dem Vorläuferamt haben manche Lehrer auch geschlossen, daß Johannis Taufe nur vorbereitend und typisch, vorbildlich auf Christi (nachpfingstliche) Taufe, gewesen sei. Nach der Schrift müssen wir uns aber hüten, daß wir sie nicht als nur vorbereitend und vorbildlich darstellen und damit ihren sakramentlichen Charakter verdunkeln. Sie war in Wirklichkeit das göttliche Sakrament der heiligen Taufe im Neuen Testament, wie die Taufe Christi zu Pfingsten. Sie übte auch dieselbe Kraft und Wirkung aus wie Christi Taufe. D. Pieper betont in seiner Dogmatik, daß die Taufe Johannis nach der Schrift wirklich Gnadenmittel war mit *vis dativa* und *vis effectiva*, und fährt dan fort: „Wie die christliche Taufe, mit der die Christen am ersten Pfingsttage getauft wurden, eine Taufe ‚zur Vergebung der Sünden‘ war, so wird auch die Taufe Johannis ausdrücklich als ‚Taufe der Buße zur Vergebung der Sünden‘ beschrieben. Und wie die christliche Taufe das Bad der Wiedergeburt und Erneuerung des Heiligen Geistes heißt, durch welches die Seligmachung geschieht, . . . so wird auch die Johannistaufe als ein Mittel beschrieben, durch welches der Heilige Geist die Wiedergeburt wirkt und ‚ein Mensch aus den Pharisäern‘ in Gottes Reich kommt, Joh. 3, 5.“ (III, S. 338.)

Daß wir die Taufe Johannis auch nicht nur als Vorbild auf die christliche Taufe behandeln sollen, führt D. Pieper aus, indem er sagt, wenn einige „den Gnadenmittelcharakter der Johannistaufe bekämpfen, treten unklare Begriffe von der Vergebung der Sünden und vom Seligwerden zutage. So bei Thomafius, wenn er sagt: ‚Die Sündenvergebung, welche die Johanneische Taufe gewährte, war mehr äußerlicher und vorbereitender Natur, analog der Wirkung der alttestamentlichen Opfer. Sie machte den, der sie empfing, noch nicht zum Gliede des Himmelreichs und bereitete ihn für dasselbe vor. So war sie ein Vorbild auf die christliche Taufe, welche sie daher auch nicht zu ersetzen vermochte.“ D. Pieper entgegnet hierauf: „Eine Sündenvergebung ‚mehr äußerlicher und vorbereitender Natur‘ ist ein undenkbarer Begriff. Man hat entweder Vergebung der Sünden, oder man hat sie nicht. . . . Thomafius' Aussage, daß die Johanneische Taufe nicht ‚zum Glied des Himmelreichs‘ gemacht habe, widerspricht der Aussage Christi Joh. 3, 5, wonach Menschen wie Nikodemus durch die Taufe Johannis in das ‚Reich Gottes‘ eingehen konnten.“ Wir sehen daraus, daß die Johannistaufe

auch dieselbe Kraft und Wirkung ausübte wie die Taufe Christi und daß auch der Ausdruck „der nach mir kommt“ keinen Unterschied zwischen beiden anzeigt.

Es hat Johannis Taufe auch nicht mit seinem Tode wieder aufgehört oder ist nicht wieder außer Kraft gesetzt worden, wie manche, auch lutherische Theologen, meinen. Die Heilige Schrift sagt nirgends, daß sie mit seinem Sterben wieder aufhören sollte oder aufgehört habe. Und so dürfen wir dieses auch nicht lehren. Vielmehr hat der Herr Jesus selber Johannis Taufe fortgeführt und in Gang erhalten, wie wir aus der Stelle Joh. 3, 22—30 und Kap. 4, 1—3 deutlich sehen. In dieser Schriftstelle wird uns recht eigentlich von Johannis und von Christi Taufe berichtet. Es heißt: „Danach kam Jesus und seine Jünger in das jüdische Land und hatte daselbst sein Wesen mit ihnen und taufte. Johannes aber taufte auch noch zu Enon, nahe bei Salim; denn es war viel Wassers daselbst. Und sie kamen dahin und ließen sich taufen. Denn Johannes war noch nicht ins Gefängnis gelegt.“ Da wird uns ausdrücklich berichtet: „Und Jesus taufte“, nämlich durch seine Jünger. Daß Jesus durch seine Jünger taufte, daraus sehen wir, daß er ihnen schon hier seinen Befehl und Auftrag zu taufen gegeben hat (nicht erst Matth. 28). Und wir merken, das Volk kam in Scharen zu Jesu und zu Johannis Taufe. Denn es bedurfte „viel Wassers“ dazu. Und Jesu und Johannis Taufe geschah unter ganz denselben Verhältnissen, lange Zeit vor Jesu Tod und Auferstehung, als Johannes noch nicht ins Gefängnis gelegt war; und ohne Zweifel geschah Jesu Taufe in ganz derselben Weise. Denn die eifersüchtigen Johannesjünger wollten sogar der Taufe Jesu wehren, konnten aber keine Verschiedenheit als Grund gegen dieselbe anführen, sondern treten zu ihrem Meister und sagen nur: „Siehe, der tauft und jedermann kommt zu ihm.“ Aber Johannes tritt für Jesu Taufe ein und sagt, daß seine, Johannis, Amts- und Taufstätigkeit jetzt abnehme und zu Ende gehe, daß aber Jesu Amts- und Taufstätigkeit jetzt zunehmen müsse. Das sei seine, Johannis, Freude. Denn nicht er, sondern Jesus sei Christus, der Welt Heiland und Bräutigam seiner Kirche. Johannes aber als Freund des Bräutigams steht und hört ihm zu und freut sich hoch über des Bräutigams Stimme. „Dieselbige meine Freude“, sagt er, „ist nun erfüllet. Er muß wachsen, ich aber muß abnehmen.“ Mit Freuden also will Johannes seine Amts- und Taufstätigkeit dem Herrn Jesu überlassen.

Und Jesus tritt wirklich in Johannis Taufstätigkeit ein, führt sie fort und tauft, und zwar nicht bloß gelegentlich einmal, sondern „er hatte daselbst sein Wesen mit ihnen“ und taufte viel Volk. Es kam vor die Pharisäer, „wie Jesus mehr Jünger machte und taufte denn Johannes“. Was antwortet damit Christus selbst auf die Frage, ob er die Taufe Johannis mit seinem Abscheiden wieder aufgehoben oder außer Kraft gesetzt und Matth. 28 eine neue Taufe an ihrer Statt eingesetzt habe? Ganz entschieden und kräftig antwortet er mit seiner

Tat: Die Taufe, die mein Vater und ich samt dem Heiligen Geist eingesetzt und dem Johannes aufgetragen haben, soll mit seinem Abscheiden nicht wieder aufhören oder aufgehoben werden; darum führe ich sie selber in meinem Amte weiter und bestätige sie als die einige göttliche Taufe des Neuen Testaments.

Wir sollen daher nicht meinen, daß die Johannistaufe nicht würdig genug gewesen sei, die eine rechte neutestamentliche Taufe für die neutestamentliche Kirche zu sein. Wie könnte eine Taufe würdiger und herrlicher sein als die, womit Gottes eigener Sohn getauft worden ist? Und wie kostbar und herrlich Gott sie hielt, zeigt er uns durch die wunderbare Auszeichnung der Taufe Jesu, nämlich dadurch, daß er sich dabei uns Menschen in allen drei Personen der Gottheit so deutlich und gnädig offenbart hat. Der Sohn steht in menschlicher Gestalt am Ufer des Jordans und betet; der Himmel tut sich über ihm auf und der Heilige Geist fährt in der sichtbaren Gestalt einer Taube auf ihn herab und salbt ihn zu seinem Erlöseramt, und der Vater bezeugt mit seiner Stimme vom Himmel: „Dies ist mein lieber Sohn, an welchem ich Wohlgefallen habe.“ In der Tat eine herrliche Auszeichnung der Johannistaufe.

So war allerdings keine neue Taufe nötig. Und wir erkennen aus der Schrift, daß Christus auch Matth. 28, vor seiner Himmelfahrt, keine neue Taufe eingesetzt, sondern die eine von Gott schon eingesetzte, gültige Taufe nur majestätisch und kräftig bestätigt und seiner Kirche des Neuen Testaments den Auftrag gegeben hat, alle Völker zu taufen. Die Worte seines Befehls lauten ja: „Darum gehet hin und machet zu Jüngern alle Völker, indem ihr sie taufet in den Namen des Vaters,“ usw. „und indem ihr sie lehret.“ (Wie Joh. 4, 1: mehr „Jünger machte und taufte“.) Das neue Moment in dieser Stelle ist also nicht, daß Christus hier eine neue Taufe eingesetzt hätte, sondern erstlich dieses, daß er seine Jünger mit derselben Taufe und Predigt in die ganze Welt und an alle Völker aussandte, um dieselben zu Jüngern zu machen, während er sie früher, Matth. 10, 5—7, nur an das Volk Israel gesandt hatte. Und das andere Neue ist, daß die Kirche des Neuen Testaments gebunden ist, „im Namen des Vaters und des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes“ zu taufen.

Mit der Verwaltung der Taufe Johannis und der Taufe Christi verhält es sich offenbar so: als Johannes starb, blieb die von ihm verwaltete Taufe in Kraft und Gültigkeit, gerade wie das Predigtamt fortbesteht und in Kraft bleibt, wenn ein Verwalter desselben stirbt; es geht nur auf eine andere Person über. So auch die Taufe Johannis: als er gefangengesetzt wurde, führte Jesus sie fort durch seine Jünger, und zwar zuerst in der Zeit vor seinem Tode und seiner Auferstehung und dann nach seiner Himmelfahrt und Ausgießung des Heiligen Geistes. So blieb die Taufe Gottes in der neutestamentlichen Kirche eine Taufe von Johannes an. „Ein Herr, ein Glaube, eine Taufe“, Eph. 4, 5.

Wir Christen freuen und trösten uns nun kräftig der Taufe Christi durch Johannes im Jordansfluß und glauben fest, daß Christus durch seine Taufe unsere Taufe geheiligt und kräftig gemacht hat, so daß unsere Taufe uns zu Gottes Kindern neu gebiert, uns mit seinem Blute von allen unsern Sünden reinwäscht und uns dem himmlischen Vater in dem Kleide der vollkommenen Gerechtigkeit Christi darstellt. Wir stimmen von Herzen in Luthers Worte ein: „Darum sollen wir wissen und glauben, daß Christus um unsertwillen getauft sei, und also sagen: Seine Taufe sei meine und meine Taufe seine Taufe; denn er ist das Lamm Gottes, welches der Welt Sünde trägt. Und daß er nun getauft wird, da wird er in unserer Person und von unsertwegen getauft, die wir von der Welt und voller Sünden sind; welche Sünde er auf sich genommen, und ist durch diese seine Taufe davon abgewaschen.“ (XII: 1136.)

Und dabei freut uns auch dieses, daß Christus uns die Taufe erhalten und fortgeführt hat, mit der er selbst getauft worden ist. So können wir mit um so größerer Freudigkeit mit Luther sagen: „Also sollst du in keinem Weg denken, . . . als wäre deine Taufe nicht so herrlich als Christi Taufe, oder wolltest dich Christi Taufe nicht annehmen. Nein, also sollst du nicht tun, das wäre nicht gut; sondern sollst deine Taufe von der Taufe Christi nicht absondern. Du mußt mit deiner Taufe in die Taufe Christi kommen, also daß Christi Taufe deine Taufe, und deine Taufe Christi Taufe, und allerdings eine Taufe sei.“ (XII: 1136.)

So sehen wir aus der Schrift, daß wirklich kein wesentlicher Unterschied zwischen Christi (nachpfingstlicher) Taufe und der Johannistaufe besteht. Von Gott eingesetzt, herrlich ausgezeichnet und von Christo kräftig bestätigt, ist die Johannistaufe ein göttliches Sakrament und in allen Stücken der Taufe Christi gleich. Sie beweist dieselbe Kraft und Wirkung zu unserer Seligkeit und gibt uns kräftigen Trost und Stärkung in Sündennot und Trübsal. Sie wurde von Christo kräftig erhalten und fortgeführt und der christlichen Kirche als Sakrament des Neuen Testaments gegeben und anbefohlen bis an den Jüngsten Tag. In dem Sinn ist wohl das Wort D. Stöckhardts zu verstehen: „Die Taufe Johannis war jetzt in die christliche Taufe übergegangen“ (Bibl. Gesch., N. T., S. 387).

Beemer, Hebr.

M. Leimer



Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)

Invocavit

Gen. 3:1-15

Here we have the first record of sin and grace. Sin is revealed in all its hideousness and fearfully disastrous consequences. But the grace of God is mightier. The marvelous beauty, the great saving power, the eternal comfort, of God's grace is revealed for the first time.

Of course, there are questions unanswered. How could Satan conceive the foolish idea to rebel against the Almighty? How could Adam and Eve, while living in Paradise, become dissatisfied and desire the forbidden fruit? How could the holy God still love His ungrateful creatures, with a love so infinite? But though we cannot answer these questions, what is necessary for our salvation is revealed.

The First Record of Sin and Grace

1. *It depicts sin in all its disastrous hideousness*
2. *It reveals the grace of God in all its saving beauty*

I

V.1. The place is the Garden of Eden, Paradise, where Adam and Eve lived in perfect bliss, in perfect holiness. God had given them an opportunity to express their love and adoration for their Creator by a certain restrictive command.

Into this Paradise enters the Tempter, who uses the serpent for his sinister purpose. The woman is addressed, her emotions are appealed to. The question is so formulatd as to arouse doubt in the Creator's goodness.

Vv.3 and 4. The woman adds to God's command, "Neither shall ye touch it." Why? Does she begin to doubt the justice of God's restrictive command?

Vv.5 and 6. The wily Tempter sees his advantage. He gives God the lie. Direct and complete denial of God's veracity and benevolent intention. He plants his own pride and ambition into the woman's soul.

V.6. Eve fell. Her looking at the forbidden tree reveals that in her heart she already had lost all fear, love, and trust in God. The eating of the fruit was but a logical sequence. Adam followed his wife into rebellion.

V.7. The consequences of sin. Their heart is now filled with shameful desires, lusts easily inflamed.

V.8. The awakening of an uneasy conscience. Childlike trust is replaced by fear and distrust.

Vv.9-13. Hideous selfishness puts the blame on others, even

on God Himself, disregards the welfare of others, lies to escape retribution, blunts the perception, they think they can deceive omniscient God.

V. 14. The curse. Here is the answer to the question, Whence all misery? By sin man has lost the bliss of Paradise and is now under the curse of God. That is the story of satanic cunning, of hideous ingratitude, of terrible misery resulting, of holy wrath and retribution. Thank God the record does not end here.

2

V. 15. These are stern words for the devil. They reveal, however, a grace unbounded, a grace filled with sweet promise and comfort. While it is possible, even probable, that the Lord explained these words to the two sinners, yet they in themselves convey a sweet message. They speak of a bloody conflict between the devil and a descendant of the woman. Since the woman expressed no astonishment when she heard the serpent speak, it is safe to assume that she and Adam knew that Satan spoke through the serpent. Here she heard that her Descendant would fight with Satan and bruise his head, that is, overcome him, conquer him. And that meant deliverance from his power, restoration of their lost estate. That Satan should bruise His heel indicated that the Deliverer should conquer by suffering and dying. That this Conquerer was called the Seed of the woman and not the seed of the man indicated that He would be something else besides being human. That this Seed was actually to conquer Satan convinced Adam and Eve that God Himself would become their Redeemer, born of a woman. To sum up: Sometime in the future there would rise up a person, a seed of the woman, yet divine, and redeem the lost and condemned sinners from all sins, from death, and from the power of the devil.

Fortified with this glorious hope, our first parents left Paradise and entered upon a life of misery. This promise of hope became clearer century after century, until at the God-appointed time the Son of God became man and as the God-man did his saving work.

H. J. BOUMAN

Second Sunday in Lent

Gen. 22:1-19

Faith grows in temptation. See Gospel for today. Abraham rightly called "Father of Believers."

A Patriarch in a Patriarchal Temptation *

1. He does not question God's Word.

God had tested Abraham on previous occasions, e. g., when He commanded him to expel Ishmael, Gen. 21:11. But God had

* See Luther, St. Louis, I:1482.

tempered this trial, v.12. The command to sacrifice Isaac, text, v.2, is different, for it seems to clash with Gen.9:6, and particularly with Gen.17:19; 21:12. Abraham's dilemma: Either God, who has revealed Himself as the absolute Truth, Gen.24:27, is not trustworthy after all (sin of blasphemy), or because of lack of gratitude God is displeased with Abraham and has revoked His former promises (sin of despair). Christians are prone to follow their reason in trials: Eve, Gen.3:3,6; Zacharias, Luke1:18; Peter, Matt.16:22. But Abraham is a patriarch in a patriarchal temptation. He carries out God's commandment immediately — early in the morning; apparently no consultation with Sarah nor Isaac. As far as Abraham is concerned, the sacrifice is *fait accompli*. V.16; Heb.11:17,18; Jas.2:21. God has spoken; the case is settled. The battle in his bosom is over and the victory won. God must solve the apparent clashes. Abraham obeys to the letter, with the whole heart, at once. — "Oh, for a faith that will not shrink!" We have God's Word as the perfect norm for faith and life. But doubts concerning such doctrines as original sin, the incarnation, predestination, arise; we stumble at apparent contradictions. Then we must take our reason captive. Our duty is not to solve, but to accept the mysteries. Or God's absolute standard of holiness clashes with man's relative ethical standard. The refractory Old Adam, the hedonistic world, and the murderous devil combine to tempt the Christian and cause terrific emotional strains. What shall the Christian do? There is only one answer, namely, the counterquestion: What has God said in His Word? Be a patriarch in a patriarchal temptation. At God's command the hardest task becomes play. Rest assured that, if necessary, God will send 10,000 angels to help you to accept God's Word without question.

2. *He will make the most of God's clearly revealed will.*

God has revealed as much of His being and will as is necessary for us. Even in the mysterious command to Abraham, God reveals His gracious purpose. And the eye of faith immediately detects it. It was the word Moriah, vv.2,14. The meaning of the word probably is "the place where God sees" or "where He is seen," i.e., where God will reveal Himself. (Luther: Moriah from *jare*, to revere, to worship, to serve God, which is done by obedience to, and absolute trust in, God and His Word. St. L., I:1493.) Thus the word Moriah is a promise that God will explain. Therefore Abraham hastens to Moriah. Your Moriah is God's Word, the public service and sermon, the instruction through your pastor and fellow Christians. Whether you are assailed by doubts concerning doctrine, e.g., the universal will of God and the election of grace, or doubts concerning Christian conduct, go to your

Moriah. But more; as a drowning man clings to the proverbial straw, so in the hour of temptation the Christian searches God's Word for something to support him, and this will become an un-sinkable lifeboat. Former promises take on a new meaning for Abraham, particularly Gen. 17:17; 18:11. Isaac has been dead once before and has been raised. God will do it again, v. 5. Cp. Heb. 11:11, 19; Rom. 4:17-21. Faith transforms the ashes of Isaac into the seed from which kings and the Messiah shall issue. Reason says: In the midst of life we are surrounded by death, but faith reverses this and says: In the midst of death we are surrounded by life. 2 Cor. 1:9; 6:9; Ps. 118:17; 1 Cor. 15:55; John 11:26. Now Isaac's question is answered, vv. 7, 8. The small text in Gen. 18:14 is expanded by faith into an exhaustive treatise of Christian doctrine. And this little verse becomes the source of unlimited power, vv. 9, 10, 12. — Hold to those promises which are clear. The nine words: Mark 16:16a will become so great and meaningful that they will close hell and open paradise for you.

3. He will go from truth to truth.

When Abraham has made the most of a relatively simple truth, God leads him to new truths. God gives Him an oath of His faithfulness, v. 16. Heb. 6:13. True, the new promise, vv. 17, 18, is similar to previous promises, 12, 3; 15:5; but it is clearer and more inclusive. Abraham's action is symbolic of the work of the Seed, Gal. 3:16; 1 Pet. 1:19, 20; Rom. 8:32. It is always thus. The more firmly faith relies on God's Word, the greater the blessings, for God is like a fountain. Cf. Large Catechism, *Trigl.*, p. 713, 55-58. And at last we shall go from Beer-sheba to the heavenly Jehovah-jareh, from faith to sight, 1 Cor. 13:12. New hymnal, 133, 5-7. Amen.

F. E. MAYER

Oculi

Psalm 25

The Book of Psalms the hymn book and prayer book of the Old Testament Church. Hymns and prayers inspired by the Spirit of God. Therefore hymns and prayers which never grow old. True, Old Testament writers had only the light of prophecy; yet their prayers are models also for us who live in the light of fulfillment. One such psalm, a prayer from beginning to end, our text for today. With the Psalmist

Let Us Lift Up Our Souls unto God in Prayer

1. For forgiveness
2. For divine guidance
3. For help in every trouble

1

The Psalmist voices various desires. Very prominent is his desire for the forgiveness of sins. V. 7: "Remember not the sins of my youth nor my transgressions." These were of two kinds, sins (*chatta'oth*, i. e., slips, missteps) and transgressions (*peshaim*, i. e., rebellions). How well this describes the sins of adolescence! Partly missteps, due to thoughtlessness and weakness, partly rebellion against God and His Law.

V. 11: "For Thy name's sake, O Lord, pardon mine iniquity; for it is great." A deep sense of guilt.

V. 18: "Forgive all my sins." He knows that they are many.

The basis of forgiveness not something in the Psalmist but "for Thy name's sake," because Thou hast the name that Thou art a merciful God and forgivest sins, and Thy name corresponds to Thine essence and attributes. Ex. 34:6, 7; Micah 7:18, 19.

We join the Psalmist in this petition for forgiveness. Jesus taught His disciples the Fifth Petition.

The believer who thus lifts up his soul unto God for forgiveness will surely find it. The name of our merciful God — the name of Jesus the Savior guarantees it. The answer, Matt. 9:2; Is. 1:18.

2

The Psalmist prays also for divine guidance. V. 4: "Show me Thy ways, O Lord; teach me Thy paths." V. 5: "Lead me in Thy truth and teach me."

The ways and paths of the Lord are those which He approves and would have the believer go. These are, first of all, the ways of God's commandments. They are, secondly, also the special ways on which He leads believers. They include joy, sorrow, success, failure, suffering.

Always the believer prays: Hymn 549:5.

This prayer for guidance is heard. V. 8: "Good and upright is the Lord; therefore will He teach sinners in the way." Sinners, here *chattaim*, those who sin in weakness, who slip, but are penitent believers. Vv. 9, 12. V. 14: "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear Him"; i. e., God holds, as it were, familiar intercourse with them, telling them what are His thoughts, "and He will show them His covenant."

These ways and paths in which He instructs and guides the believer are good. V. 10: "All the paths of the Lord are mercy and truth unto such as keep His covenant," etc. Old Testament counterpart of Rom. 8:28.

3

Forgiveness and guidance are the most necessary gifts. But the believer prays also for help in his manifold troubles.

V. 2: "O my God, I trust in Thee; let me not be ashamed; let

not mine enemies triumph over me." V. 16: "Turn Thee unto me and have mercy upon me, for I am desolate and afflicted." Vv. 17, 18a, 19, 20.

What believer is there who has not troubles of his own which would cause him to join with the Psalmist in these prayers for help?

Such prayers are heard. V. 15: "He shall pluck my feet out of the net." Yes, God will abundantly bless His own. V. 13: "His soul shall dwell at ease, and his seed shall inherit the earth."

Having such a God, who is merciful and forgiving and ready to guide and help and bless, who would not lift up His soul unto Him in trusting prayer, pleading for forgiveness, for guidance, for help? Hymn 457.

FRED KRAMER

Laetare

Deut. 7:6-11

The season of Lent brings home to us God's earnest demand that we render Him sincere and wholehearted service, Matt. 26:41; Luke 23:28. — Such service the people in the Gospel for this Sunday did not render the Lord, John 6:15. They were earthly-minded, selfish, materialistic, seeking only the gifts of this world, and not Christ's spiritual blessings, and this despite the Savior's ineffable goodness, v. 5; Matt. 14:14. But so the Jews as a nation have always scorned God's kindness. Acts 7:51. — How do we respond to His goodness, exhibited especially in the sacred story of Lent? Let us examine ourselves today on this point.

God's Unspeakable Goodness Toward Us

We consider

1. *How God's great love has been manifested*
2. *Our joyous, willing response to His love*

I

Toward Israel God manifested His love by making this nation His "holy people," v. 6; Jer. 2:3. Israel was *dedicated* to God and so blessed with the highest temporal and spiritual blessings, v. 8c; Deut. 33:1ff. Not only our text, but the whole Old Testament depicts God's uncountable benedictions bestowed on Israel.

This amazing exaltation of Israel was not due to any merit or worthiness of the people as such, V. 7. Scripture describes to us Israel's lowly beginning, Gen. 12:1-3; Is. 51:1. 2. It also tells us of Israel's sinful stubbornness, Is. 65:2; Rom. 10:21. — The cause of Israel's exaltation was (a) God's *unmerited love*, v. 8; 10:15; Is. 43:3, 4; (b) God's *gracious covenant* with Israel, v. 8b; Luke 1:55, 72, 73; (c) God's *faithfulness*, v. 9; Heb. 11:11. — Israel's tem-

poral and spiritual blessings thus had their source in God's free grace, Is. 54:10.

As Israel, so also we have been blessed with innumerable blessings, temporal and spiritual. Consider the good land which God has given us with all the blessings of our daily bread enumerated by Luther in his explanation of the Fourth Petition. — But contemplate yet more the greater spiritual blessings which we consider especially in the season of Lent. All these blessings have been given us without any merit or worthiness on our part, solely by the grace of God, who in His great love has chosen us and in His faithfulness has showered His blessings of body and soul upon us even when we did not deserve them. — What shall be our response to God? He demanded of Israel joyous, willing service. He demands the same of us today. Let our response to His love be joyous and willing.

2

God made known to Israel His demand in very clear and impressive words, v. 11. Israel was to observe all the laws of God, His commandments, statutes, judgments. Not only the Moral Law, but also the Ceremonial Law and the Political Law were to be kept by Israel, for which reason God in our text speaks of commandments, statutes, and judgments, which terms describe God's laws from different points of view. This earnest demand we find repeated throughout the Old Testament, especially in Ex. 20:1 ff. and Deut. 5:1 ff. — In addition, He threatened them with severest punishments in case they would fail to render Him cheerful, willing obedience, v. 10; Is. 59:18; Ex. 20:5. — These threats have been executed upon the stubborn, rebellious Jews, whose city was destroyed and who were scattered throughout the nations as a manifestation of God's just wrath, Luke 23:31; Matt. 24:2.

As of Israel, so God asks also of us cheerful and willing obedience, e. g., Gal. 5:16 ff.; Eph. 5:1 ff. His wrath will be upon us, as it was upon Israel, if we fail to obey His commandments, v. 10; Gal. 6:6, 7. Let this wrath of God move us to serve Him. Lent pictures to us also God's great wrath upon sin, for if God so severely punished our transgressions in His dear Son, our Substitute, how much greater will be our punishment if we refuse to obey Him? — But should not rather God's goodness move us to love Him above all things and to do what He desires us to do? If God has glorified His love and faithfulness in our election, redemption, conversion, and sanctification, should we not walk as His dear children after the example of our Redeemer? Rom. 12:1 ff.; Phil. 2:5 ff. — May this Lenten season lead us to a deeper appreciation of God's goodness and love, 1 John 4:19; 3:18, and to more cheerful and willing obedience to Christ Jesus, our Lord.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Miscellanea

The Testimony of the Skies *

By R. LAIRD HARRIS, Faith Theological Seminary

The Hebrew Text of Psalm 19:4

"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth His handiwork." These majestic words introduce to us a Psalm that is as wonderful in its teaching as it is favorite to the hearts of many of God's people. The subject of the Psalm is neither the wonders of the heavens nor the perfections of God's Law, but rather the greatness of our God as revealed in both His Word and works. The Psalm therefore ends with a humble prayer for God's cleansing power and gracious acceptance.

Familiar as the Psalm is to God's people, probably many do not realize that it is quoted in the New Testament and that this quotation raises certain problems in the interpretation of the Psalm. In Romans 10:18 Paul, arguing that the Jews are sinning against knowledge, points out that a witness to God has been given by the starry heavens even to the ends of the earth. Paul had already asserted this universal witness of nature and conscience in Romans 1:20 and 2:15, but now he quotes from Psalm 19:4 to prove that Jews as well as Gentiles are without excuse and actually disobedient to God's revelation. This much seems clear, but it is the form of the quotation that poses a slight problem. Romans 10:18 says "their *sound* went into all the earth and their words unto the ends of the world," but Psalm 19:4 says "Their *line* is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world." The two verses agree in everything except the word "sound" in the New Testament representing "line" in the Old Testament. The difference indeed is not great. And yet it is very hard to see how the word "line" used in the Old Testament for measurement both in building and as a line stretched forth to measure the destruction of a city can be represented in the New Testament by "sound."

The easiest method of treating with such a problem (which after all is not serious) is to say that it is a matter of obscure interpretation. The Scofield Bible in a note on Hebrews 10:5 ascribes such variations to the freedom of quotation which may be exercised by the Holy Spirit. This would be a fair answer except that the purpose of using the Old Testament quotation is to show the agreement of the New Covenant with the Old, and we should not expect such divergencies. A far better method is to investigate the text both of the New Testament and the Old Testament in these cases and see if there is any evidence of a mistake in copying. The methods of textual criticism should certainly be employed before any answer is given.

* This interesting, scholarly, and helpful article appeared in *The Bible Today*, published by the National Bible Institute of New York, and permission to reprint it was kindly given by the President and Editor, Dr. J. Oliver Buswell, Jr.

We are all familiar with the science of textual criticism of the New Testament, but some may be surprised to find that the Old Testament text should be treated similarly. This science of textual criticism proceeds on the basis of manuscript evidence for both Testaments. It must be clearly distinguished from the so-called "higher criticism" of a generation ago, which based itself on subjective criteria of style, conjecture, etc., and led to results as numerous as the critics themselves. The higher criticism often ended by such radical division and mutilation of the record that, for many, the very foundations of the faith were destroyed. Textual criticism, on the other hand, proceeds according to evidence and well-established laws, which lead to definite results easily checked by anyone.

B. B. Warfield, in his book *Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, gives in compact form the principles of the science of textual criticism, which are applicable with slight modifications to the Old Testament field. There are two basic inquiries—first in the direction of the internal evidence, that is, which of the various manuscript readings fits the whole context best; second, in the direction of the external evidence, that is, which reading has the strongest support in the existing copies. Internal evidence in turn is divided by Warfield into "intrinsic evidence," that is, the suitability of the reading in the context and "transcriptional evidence," that is, the probability of one reading being a mistake arising out of another. External evidence also is not so simple as at first appears, for the majority of manuscripts with a certain reading are not always right (the majority often being late), and the oldest manuscripts are not always correct either. The fact is that all the evidence must be assembled and carefully analyzed before a reading is chosen.

Now when we look at the Hebrew text of Psalm 19:4, we find that all the Hebrew manuscripts agree that the reading of the consonants should be "q w m," "their line." This would seem to decide the matter, but we must remember that we also have some early translations of the Old Testament into other languages, and it is necessary to consult these. Of these translations, called "versions," the most important is the Greek translation, which seems to have been made about two centuries before Christ, called the Septuagint. This version, preserved to us in several important manuscripts, here has the word "phthongos," "sound." The first Latin version made by Jerome, about 400 A. D., was translated from this Greek Septuagint version, and it also says "sound" or, in Latin, "sonus." We may argue from this that the Greek translators of about 200 B. C. had the Hebrew word for "sound" in their Bibles, or at least thought they did.

Soon after the time of Christ, a Jew by the name of Symmachus decided the old Greek version was not satisfactory, so he made a new Greek translation. We have parts of this version of Symmachus and find that he translated Psalm 19:4 with the Greek word "echos" (from which we get "echo"), meaning "sound." So his Hebrew Bible still seems to have the word "sound" here. Somewhere about this time the Jews and Christians of Northern Mesopotamia were using a Syriac translation of the Old Testament called the "Peshitto" version, and this

also has the word "sound," Psalm 19:4 (the evidence is summarized in Meyer's commentary on Romans 10:18). Later on, after 400 A. D., Jerome made a second translation of the Psalms into Latin in addition to the one mentioned above, but this time he translated them out of the Hebrew. This time also he uses the Latin word "sonus," "sound," showing that he believed the Hebrew text of 400 A. D. had, or should have, the word "sound" in Psalm 19:4.

So far it looks very much as if the important evidence, except for the Hebrew manuscripts, all points in the direction of the word "sound" in this place. But there is one interesting exception. Shortly after the time of Christ and before Symmachus did his work, a Jew named Aquila became dissatisfied with the Septuagint Greek version and made his own Greek translation. In this place (see the evidence summarized in Brigg's commentary on the Psalms) Aquila used the word "kanon" (from which we get the expression "canon law"), meaning "rule." Apparently the Hebrew manuscript which Aquila used possessed the word "q w m," "their line." On the other hand, the Hebrew manuscripts used by Jerome in 400 A. D., by Symmachus at about 200 A. D., by the translators of the Syriac Peshitto version soon after Christ and by the translators of the Greek Septuagint version at about 200 B. C., all had the Hebrew word for "sound" in this place. Unfortunately, all these Hebrew manuscripts have been lost, but we know what they were by the versions made from them.

We should now try to find which reading is correct. As can be seen above, the external evidence from the Hebrew manuscripts and the various translations is divided. And yet the oldest evidence favors the reading "their sound." When we look to the internal evidence, we should first ask what the Hebrew would be for "their sound is gone out through all the earth." Of course, there are several Hebrew words for "sound," but one very common one is the word translated "voice" in verse three of our Psalm. This Hebrew word in the form "their sound" would have the consonants "q l m." "Their sound" is very close to the word "q w m," "their line," and we can easily understand how the present Hebrew text reading "q w m" may have arisen by mistake in copying the "w" instead of "l." We would say that the "transcriptional evidence" points to a simple mistake in copying one letter.

Now the "intrinsic evidence" mentioned by Warfield also should be investigated. Which reading suits the context better? Each one may decide for himself on inspection of the Psalm. Verse one tells about the witness of the heavens to God. Verse two says the regular succession of day and night tells of a God of order. Verse three, according to the Authorized Version, declares that this witness of the heavens sounds out to all men. In this place the Revised Version makes a flat negative statement: "their voice is not heard." This translation is no closer to the Hebrew than is the Authorized Version and is against the context in the last half of verse four, which says that their words go out to the end of the world! The Revised Version here is really a mistranslation. Now, it seems clear that the context of verse four is telling about the universal witness of the heavens. The parallel last half of

verse four speaks of the words of the heavens being heard far and wide. Verses five and six specify the sun, whose heat all men feel as a testimony to the creator God. The conclusion should therefore be obvious that the first half of verse four should read "their sound is gone out through all the earth," and the Hebrew reading "q w m" should be rejected in favor of "q l m."

The above is a simple problem in Old Testament textual criticism, and the result is not new. For example, Meyer's commentary on Romans 10:18 reaches the same conclusion. A further word may be said as a consequence of the above extended discussion. What about the relation of the New Testament quotation to the above argument? First we shall notice that the Old Testament text as corrected by textual criticism is in exact accord with the New Testament quotation, and the problem we noticed at the beginning simply vanishes! There was no problem, really. The only problem was one made for us by a mistake in copying one Hebrew letter.

Our second point is even more important. From what did Paul quote his Old Testament verse? From the Hebrew or from the Septuagint? It is usually said that the New Testament authors quote freely from the Septuagint, and this is logical, for they wrote in Greek. It would seem at first sight that here Paul followed the Septuagint Greek version in opposition to the Hebrew text. But does the above evidence argue so? Rather the above discussion shows that at least some Hebrew manuscripts of Paul's time were in exact accord with the Septuagint Greek version of Paul's time. It is no wonder that Paul followed this same reading of the text as the Septuagint translators had done before him and the Peshitto translators, the Jew Symmachus and the Christian Jerome, were to do after him. Actually from this comparison of Psalm 19:4 with Romans 10:18 we cannot say that Paul quoted from the Septuagint. The fact is that at that time the Hebrew and Septuagint agreed, and this particular corruption entered the Hebrew text or gained ascendancy in the Hebrew tradition after Paul's day.

A word of caution should be added before closing our study of this particular text. It should not be thought that our results, which note minor errors in copying, work against the doctrine of verbal inspiration. We know that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost" (2 Pet. 1:21) and were so moved that they wrote without error. But God entrusted His sacred Word to human channels which revered the record, but unavoidably made some mistakes in copying. Most of us have even noticed mistakes in printing of the English Bible in cheaper editions. The Scofield Bible in a note to 1 Corinthians 10:8 points out how especially easy it is for numerals to be miscopied. But these mistakes are minor and do not affect to any appreciable extent the facts and doctrines of Holy Scripture. Rather they are to be corrected by careful, consecrated study. As Warfield points out, it is important in the study of the Bible to "test its correctness" to show how well it has been providentially preserved by God as well as to "emend its errors." (*Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, p. 4.)

We have shown how scholarly study of the Old and the New Testa-

ment text yields results both of interest and value. There are many such Old Testament quotations in the New Testament which should be similarly studied. Perhaps the meaning of this Psalm will be made clearer to some by this treatment. And to this end we should close with a literal translation of the first part of this fine specimen of Hebrew poetry in praise to the God who has given a universal revelation of Himself in His works of creation and a special holy revelation of Himself in his Word of redemption, mentioned after verse seven.

To the Chief Musician, a Psalm of David

The heavens are declaring the glory of God, and the expanse of the sky is showing the work of His hands.

Day to day utters speech, and night to night shows knowledge.

There is no speech and no language where their voice is not heard.

Their sound has gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world.

He has placed a tent in them for the sun,

Who is like a bridegroom going out of his room [to the wedding]

Or is like a young man keyed up to run a race.

From one end of the heavens is his [the sun's] going out,

And his course is unto their other end, and there is nothing hid from his heat.

Did John the Baptist Practice Infant Baptism?

This question is raised in an article of the *Presbyterian* of December 3, 1942. The Rev. J. R. Browne of Greenfield, Mo., writing on the topic "Did John the Baptist Baptize Infant Children?", arrives at an affirmative answer. His proof he finds in the prophecy Joel 2:1-16, in which he says a striking picture of John the Baptist is given us "preparing the bride in the wilderness for her coming Bridegroom." The call is there issued, "Gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts; let the Bridegroom come forth of His chamber and the bride of her closet." That this was fulfilled in the ministry of John the Baptist the writer holds is proved not only by the report of the work of John in general, but by John's statement "He that hath the bride is the Bridegroom," John 3:29. While it is very true, as Mr. Browne contends, that the Church is called Christ's bride and that this is an Old Testament name for the Church, we must say that what he presents here as proof for infant baptism as practiced by John, the reference to children in Joel's prophecy, is not convincing.

A.



Theological Observer

The Matter of Lutheran Church Union.—One of the most important numbers of the *Journal of Theology of the American Lutheran Conference* ever published is the "convention number" (January, 1943), containing a complete record of the proceedings of the sixth biennial convention of the American Lutheran Conference, held in Rock Island, Ill., Nov. 11—13, 1942. Since reports had to be made to the constituent synods of the American Lutheran Conference concerning the progress made in the Lutheran church union movement, practically everything was made a matter of record that has occurred since the last convention of the Conference two years ago. But at times the official reports go back still farther. In the major reports the union movement is traced back to its beginning and this gives the reader a survey of the entire activity in the Lutheran Church in America on behalf of church union. In addition to being complete, the reports aim to be fair, objective, and conducive to a better understanding among the various Lutheran synods in our country. The number should be studied by all our pastors and intelligent laymen. It costs 50 cents and is published by the American Lutheran Conference at 200 Front Street, Blair, Nebr.

Nowhere in the "convention number" is emphasis laid on the fact that in considerable areas of the U. L. C. A. and the A. L. Cf. there are still differences in doctrine and practice and that therefore the necessary inward unity is lacking to cement these bodies into really united churches, though the Mendota Resolutions speak of existing obstacles which, it is hoped, may be removed. An instance of such obstacles has appeared in a review of H. C. Leupold's *Exposition of Genesis* (published by the Wartburg Press last year), which is offered in *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (January, 1943). The review, which in general is favorable, criticizes in nearly forty lines Leupold's defense of the Mosaic authorship of Genesis "by citing the grounds for positive argument and omitting those for the negative," and the reviewer, Charles M. Cooper, writes: "This is not the kind of proof for which the Reformer called. On the contrary, it substitutes Jewish tradition (which is found also in the New Testament) for the Word of God and dogmatic assertion for sound arguments." Then, after having given some very interesting comments on the Baltimore Declaration and the Pittsburgh Agreement and their implications, he goes on to say: "The supposition that Moses wrote Genesis is now, in the Lutheran view of the Scriptures as well as in the modern view of historiography, not only ridiculous but terribly wrong. . . . To compress all this history into Moses' lifetime, as a Papal commission requires Catholic scholars to do, simply makes impossible an adequate and a Lutheran treatment of the Bible as the Word of God." Here is Gettysburg's fight on behalf of the long-discarded theories of destructive higher criticism. Here are dyed-in-the-wool, hard-shell modernistic reactionaries that vehemently oppose Christian conservatism in the U. L. C. A. and the A. L. Cf. These liberal

leaners-back caused trouble in Omaha, where conservative theological sentiment prevailed, and they are causing trouble today. Nevertheless, a careful study of the events described in the "convention number" show that considerable progress has been made along the lines of Lutheran conservatism. The testimony of God's Word has not proved in vain. In his address "Charting the Future Course of American Lutheranism" Dr. R. H. Long, executive director of the National Lutheran Council, says a number of things which not every Lutheran in our country may accept. But he emphasizes also such things: "There must be no let-down in our adherence to the Scriptures, no compromise on the fundamental [?] doctrines of our faith [the question mark is to call attention to a problem involved], no temporizing with the world and no compromising of the truth. If this course is pursued, the pattern and form of our external organization, no matter how it develops, will succeed." Again: "We must not forget that with the opportunities that present themselves to our Lutheran Zion in the future, there will be correspondingly great dangers. The only sure safeguard against them is to be faithful to the Lord and to the truth. The Lutheran Church of tomorrow, in order to assure her safety and success, must continue to be a confessional Church as well as a co-operating Church." If such statements are meant sincerely—and we have no reason to assume that this is sheer hypocrisy—then by God's grace there is yet hope, not merely for an outward church union, but for true church unity.

J. T. M.

Dr. Reu on the Louisville Fellowship Resolution.—In the *Kirchliche Zeitschrift* of December, 1942, Dr. Reu publishes his opinion on the resolution of the U. L. C. A. concerning fellowship with the A. L. C. We reprint the whole important editorial, in which there is likewise a reference to the refusal of the U. L. C. A. to enter the Federal Council of Churches.

"The United Lutheran Church in America held her convention at Louisville, Ky., during the second half of October. We today mention only two resolutions passed by this body. With a great majority it refused to enter the Federal Council of Churches. This is good news; it shows that there is still a goodly number of sound Lutherans in that Church who are not ready to endanger their own stand and that of their Church by entrance into a non-Lutheran and outspokenly liberal organization.

"The second resolution refers to the relation of the U. L. C. A. to our Church. It reads: '*Resolved*, That (1) We receive with appreciation and deep gratitude to God the resolution of the American Lutheran Church in convention assembled at Mendota, Ill., which recognizes our fundamental agreement and proclaims their readiness to establish full pulpit and altar fellowship with the United Lutheran Church. (2) We instruct the president of our Church, in conjunction with the president of the American Lutheran Church, to consummate and declare at the earliest possible date the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship."

"We cannot understand how such a resolution could be proposed and passed. Did the United Lutheran Church not see that according

to our Mendota resolution it is the convention of the Church and not its president that is to decide whether church fellowship can be declared or not? Does the United Lutheran Church really believe that the two presidents can remove the still 'existing obstacles' that made the establishment of church fellowship impossible in the past? Can they convince those of the pastors of the U. L. C. A. who belong to lodges that they must leave the lodge and begin earnestly to testify against it? Can they stop 'indiscriminate fellowship' with the Reformed churches? Can they bring it about that the *publica doctrina* of the U. L. C. A. is brought into full harmony with the third point of the Pittsburgh Agreement ('errorless Scripture')? These are the 'existing obstacles' that must be removed, and without their removal there can be no 'full and wholehearted acceptance of and adherence to the documents' mentioned in the resolutions of the American Lutheran Church and no establishment of church fellowship." A.

A Strong Blast in the A. L. C. Against Unionism. — In the *Lutheran Standard* for January 16, 1943, the page called the Question Box, conducted by Rev. Wm. N. Emch, Groveport, Ohio, voices sentiments against unionism which we are happy to bring to the attention of our readers. Somebody had asked three questions: 1. Is it in accord with Lutheran doctrine and practice when a local Lutheran congregation participates in a community Thanksgiving or Christmas service? 2. Will such practice be a hindrance to the merging of the Lutheran Church in America? 3. Is it proper for a community-minded member of the Lutheran Church to urge the members of his church to attend the union Thanksgiving service in the church of another denomination when there is a Thanksgiving service conducted in his own church? We herewith print the reply of Pastor Emch.

1. This is not in accord with the doctrine and practice of our Church. These union services are of evil, and we warn against them.

In the first place, these union services on special occasions are detrimental rather than helpful in getting people to attend church. Let us suppose that in a certain community there are four small congregations of various denominations. If the four unite in a union service, the attendance will, of course, be considerably larger than each church would have for its own individual service. But the result, as a rule, would be about as follows: Attendance at the union service between two and three hundred. Average attendance of the four churches if each had its own service, about one hundred. Thus the four separate services would, as a rule, bring at least one fourth to one half more people to the house of God than one union service.

But the chief objection to these union services is this: they ignore and belittle doctrinal differences. They encourage error and compromise truth. If the Lutheran Church has anything distinctive to which it is in duty bound to cling, and if the neighboring churches teach error which we cannot conscientiously endorse or encourage, then fidelity to the truth as we understand it compels us to remain separate. Why pretend that we are united in our faith when it is not true? And if we are united, why keep up separate denominations? If, without

compromising truth or encouraging error, we can worship together on festival occasions, why can we not do so Sunday after Sunday? If faithfulness to God's Word does not compel us to remain separate, then it is a sin to continue as a separate denomination. What right have we to cause or to continue divisions in the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ if faithfulness to Him and to the truth as He has given it to us does not compel us to do so? The moment the Lutheran denomination or any denomination ceases to have anything distinct, for which it must conscientiously contend, it forfeits its right to exist as a separate denomination.

2. Yes, indeed, this practice of unionism on the part of some Lutherans is a serious obstacle in the way of merging the various Lutheran divisions in America.

3. The answer to this question is obvious. It is strange that I should work to the detriment of my own Church. If my Church is not worthy of existence, then let it die and disband. It is of far greater importance that I be true to my God and faithful to the truth of His Word than that I be a hail fellow well met in the community. A.

About Face of Many Pacifists.—On this subject the *Watchman-Examiner* of December 17, 1942, writes editorially: "During the past two years we have seen a virtual revolution in ecclesiastical ideas concerning war. It is a far cry from the declaration of the Oxford Conference in 1937 that all war is sin to the pronouncement of the Methodist bishops of the United States in 1942 that 'there has arisen in the world a pagan philosophy driven by unchristian motives and bent upon establishing its will upon mankind. Against this ideology and its supporters the United Nations have set themselves with grim determination. We pledge ourselves to the destruction of this brutal and unwarranted aggression and to the preservation for all mankind of the sacred liberties of free peoples.' Does not this illustrate that man-made resolutions—of which we are inclined, at the time we make them, to be so proud—are so frequently reflections of the temporary mood? The belligerency of the Methodist bishops is very different from their former pacifist conviction. No doubt, they feel as righteous now as they stand by the rivers of blood as they did when they proclaimed green pastures. Both moods may be right. [?] But what can save us from our miscalculations? Only the Word of God. God has not left us in the dark as to the what, why, and wherefore of war. Perhaps we would not be at war if we had heeded that Word." Our readers themselves will give the last thought a more correct form. A.

A Well-deserved Rebuke of Social Gospelites.—A professor of Christian Education at the Episcopal theological school at Cambridge, Mass., Dr. Adelaide T. Case, at a large meeting made the statement "Empty churches have resulted from the failure of Christian churches to capture the imagination of youth." The *Watchman-Examiner* presents some good comments on this charge. "This sort of statement has been made repeatedly in recent years, and it needs correction. Our Lord had nothing to say about capturing the imagination of youth. It cannot

be said that denominational leaders have not made the attempt. Following the last World War, the imagination of youth was appealed to in passionate terms that they 'should go out and make a new world.' Dr. Case wishes Christianity to be a greater revolutionary force. Could there be anything more revolutionary than the social gospel, which has been emphasized in the generation now coming to a close? Was not an appeal made to youth to undertake the reform of politics, industry, labor, capital, public housing, and to promote every variety of social reconstruction? Were they not appealed to to become fanatical pacifists, demanding in those nations where they could exert their influence under their national freedom a complete disarmament and an entirely negative attitude toward war? To what avail? After twenty-two years of this intense form of agitation, where are we now? Shall we again carry this kind of program to our youth in the reconstruction period that will follow this war? How shall we 'capture the imagination of youth'? It is our judgment, with ancient history behind us and contemporary history before us, that the function of the Church is to capture the heart of youth that God may dwell therein and inspire each one spiritually." This is well said. And the hearts, let us remember, must be captured by the Holy Spirit Himself, working through the blessed Gospel of Jesus Christ.

A.

Catechetical Instruction Advocated.—A correspondent of the *Lutheran* breaks a strong lance for old-fashioned catechetical instruction. Speaking of the Christian faith, the writer says: "Only when one knows and thoroughly understands, can one fully believe and support it wholeheartedly. The idea has been recognized throughout the whole history of the Lutheran Church. Our Church has always aimed at a congregation of believers, well versed in the doctrines to which they subscribe and filled with knowledge sufficient to defend this same faith against all who would destroy it. From the time of the Catechumenate, throughout the work of Martin Luther, throughout the work of Muhlenberg, and on through our history the Lutheran Church has always felt the responsibility of catechetical instruction and has urged that the Church labor consistently in this field of endeavor." We are glad that this note is sounded. All sections of the Lutheran Church need it.

A.

Obstacles to Union of Presbyterians and Episcopalians.—Writing on the subject "Not a Union of Equals," a writer in the *Presbyterian* discusses the attempts that are being made at present to unite the two church bodies mentioned. He says, "The Presbyterian advocates of union with the Episcopal Church are working hard to convince the members of our Church that the union is to be that of two equals." He continues, "There is a good reason why they must work so hard to do this, and that reason is that the facts are against them." The facts which he mentions are the following: "No priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church has authority to give a letter of dismission to one of his parishioners who wishes to unite with the Presbyterian Church."—"Letters of dismission from Presbyterian churches are not received by Episcopal churches as sufficient evidence that the persons named in

those letters are worthy of being received as members of the Episcopal Church."—"There seems to be some difference of opinion among Episcopalian clergymen as to whether or not Presbyterians or any other Protestants should be permitted to partake of the elements of the Lord's Supper in the Episcopal Church. The Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on Church Union apparently is not of the opinion that the present position of the Episcopal Church makes Presbyterians welcome."—"While the Protestant Episcopal Church recognizes Roman Catholic clergymen to be true priests or ministers of Christ, inasmuch as they have received episcopal ordination, it does not recognize Presbyterian clergymen as true ministers, inasmuch as they have not been episcopally ordained." The writer reaches this conclusion: "The more I have considered the facts which are given above, the more convinced I have become that, if the union takes place, the Episcopal Church will be welcoming back home the wayward child, who like the prodigal left the father's house and for a period of four hundred years dwelt in a far country."

The principle upon which the Episcopal position is based rests on the error that the episcopacy as it is found in the Episcopal Church is divinely ordained. The two church bodies should thresh out this question, and union should not be sought in the easy method of simply ignoring this difference.

A.

Dr. Truett on Religious Liberty.—In an article which appeared in the *Watchman-Examiner* on December 10, 1942, the well-known Baptist leader Dr. George W. Truett makes some remarks on religious liberty which deserve being heeded. The heading of his article is "Our Baptist Message to the World." We quote a paragraph: "In illustration of the subtle, but real encroachments upon liberty in America, call to mind the recent agitation in connection with the national Congress to include church employees in Federal Security pensions. To be sure, such proposal was defeated by church pressure, but let the ominous fact be remembered that it was also church pressure that introduced the question into Congress. Again, take the fact of the allocation of public funds to sectarian purposes. That question has long and often been in the public mind, in one form and another. Bills are proposed, in various States, again and again, for taxes to be appropriated for sectarian schools. If haply any of our Baptist people have, in an hour of weakness, been in any way enthralled by this encroachment, let them speedily repent of such inconsistent course, and go and sin no more! Nothing in all the world is worth doing wrong for! Right at this point all our people need to be wide awake to danger and faithful to principle, or results will badly plague us later on. Once more, the frank declaration is here made that any trend or suggestion of the possible establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States and the Vatican has called forth an immediate and unyielding protest from uncounted millions of our American people." Our doctrine of religious liberty in America is for all our people alike. The Pope is simply the honored head of the Roman Catholic Church, and the plea that his dominion over a few acres of ground, called the Vatican City, gives

him the status of a temporal sovereign is essentially unreal. He has, in fact, no better title to receive governmental recognition from the United States than has the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States, or the Presiding Bishop of the United Methodist Church of this country. We call God to witness that we do not wish to be petty and inconsistent and unchristian in our frank reference to this matter. But we do wish to be consistent and faithful to priceless principles, profoundly believing that these principles are of indispensable value, alike to Baptists, to Protestants of every name, to Catholics, to Jews, to Quakers, to everybody in our land." That, in view, on the one hand, of Rome's attempt to make the State subservient to its purposes and, on the other, of the efforts of the Federal Council to have itself acknowledged as the official mouthpiece of Protestantism, religious liberty is jeopardized should be evident to all observers.

A.

The Baptist View of Church Polity.—Three general Baptist bodies of America, the Southern, the Northern, and the National Baptist Conventions, have an Associated Committee on Public Relations. Before this committee Dr. Rufus W. Weaver read an essay which is printed in the *Watchman-Examiner* of November 5, 1942. A section of this essay speaks of Baptist church polity, and for an understanding of Baptist principles it is well to take note of what Dr. Weaver says. "A local Baptist church comes into existence through the action of a group of Christian believers, all having obeyed the command of Christ to be baptized in accordance with the mode the New Testament requires, and the action they collectively take in forming a local Baptist Church is the free and voluntary dedication of each and all of them to the realization of certain common purposes that they hold to be the outline of the Christian way of life. This is called by them 'Our Covenant.' This body may or may not have a confession of faith. It has no set forms of worship. Each of these churches is sovereign, independent, varying in doctrinal views, free to frame its own program of Christian activities as it pleases. The dominant desire is to live so that others may see in their conduct the meaning of the Christian way of life. . . . There are items in this covenant which cannot be carried out unless there be co-operation of Baptist churches with other Baptist churches. The bodies that are thus formed, made up of these independent Baptist churches, are called Associations and Conventions. The first has to do with the promotion of Christian fellowship among the churches in a given section. The second deals with the raising of funds contributed for the carrying on of a program which no local church can successfully conduct by itself. This program includes evangelism, education, benevolence, and missions." Concerning the large conventions Dr. Weaver says, "Each of these bodies may pass resolutions, but these are binding only upon the persons present at the sessions." Baptists, as is evident from the above, carry on the policies sponsored by the so-called Independents in England in the 17th century. Their conception that conventions are merely advisory bodies is sound.

A.

The Church in Latin America.—Under this heading there appeared in *The Catholic Digest* (November, 1942) an article by Frans van Cauwelaert (a condensation from the "Tablet," Reading, England, August, 1942) in which the writer deplors the lamentable religious conditions prevailing in Roman Catholic Latin America. The article in part has been sent to various Protestant pastors and religious organizations in our country by the Committee on Co-operation in Latin America as informative material on the activities and attitudes of the Roman Catholic Church, together with an "open letter" by the Cuba Council of Evangelical Churches in protest to the "propaganda by a coterie of North American Roman Catholics against the presence in Latin America of missionaries of evangelical churches, on the ground that they are an obstacle to harmonious relations between the two Americas." Careful study of the two documents shows that on the one hand Roman Catholicism grossly neglects the spiritual interests of the people in Latin America and on the other that it opposes Protestant mission work, which endeavors to provide for their spiritual needs. The matter, of course, is not new, but some of the facts deserve re-emphasis.

In Cauwelaert's *The Church in Latin America* we find such revealing statements as the following: "The monasteries are abandoned or occupied by only a few monks, too few to ensure a properly maintained life; the churches, in general, display a dreadful poverty. This deplorable state of affairs is less apparent in the important towns, where the big churches have often kept the external appearances of their former grandeur or have remained the scene of a priestly activity which may give an illusory impression of the state of the Church in general; but as soon as one ventures forth into the countryside, one is everywhere struck by the indisputable signs of a great decay."—"In Peru and in Mexico . . . there is no more than one priest for 6,000 inhabitants. In Argentina there is one priest for 8,571 inhabitants. In Brazil there is one for 9,528 inhabitants. In Guatemala there is one for 25,396 inhabitants; and in this latter country there are districts of 100,000 inhabitants or more where all pastoral care is left to one single priest. Even a Francis Xavier would not be equal to such a task; for it must be remembered that these are no pagan masses [?] but populations vowed to Christ for four centuries and sincerely invoking His holy name. And the material and moral conditions in which the priests must exercise their apostolate are not of a kind to make their superhuman task any easier."

As a Protestant reads these distressing facts, recorded by a Roman Catholic, he cannot but ask himself the question why the Roman Catholic Church has so disgracefully neglected these peoples which it claims as its followers. Conditions evidently are similar here to those in Europe when Dr. Martin Luther began the great Church Reformation. Rome has reverted to type. But what a Protestant can understand still less is how Rome, claiming to be a Christian Church, can object to the assistance which evangelical churches are offering to the neglected peoples in Latin America, or how in the name of common sense it can regard them as "obstacles to harmonious relations between the two

Americas." The "open letter" of the Cuba Council of Evangelical Churches demonstrates very clearly that the work of the evangelical churches in Latin America has greatly fostered the harmonious relations between the two Americas. The document is far too long to be quoted here, but when Catholic communities time and again have honored Protestant missionaries who devoted their lives to the welfare of Latin American communities as "distinguished citizens" and conferred upon them other titles of distinction and trust, then the obstacles to harmonious relations between the two Americas could not be so very serious. Another fact that must not be forgotten is that the evangelical workers in Cuba are largely natives. Of 193 ministers, for example, 173 are Cuban. Of 20 American missionaries only 2 devote their full time to the pastorate of Cuban congregations. As the unbiased reader studies the "open letter" of the evangelical churches, noting its moderation and fairness throughout, its closing appeal certainly leaves a deep impression upon his mind: "We look to leaders of American public opinion to investigate carefully and impartially the history and actual conditions of the evangelical churches in Latin America; to judge for themselves as to the estimate set upon American missionaries by the rank and file of the citizens of Latin American countries. We hold no brief for those who imprudently offend the sensibilities of our Latin American friends by improper attitudes, words, and actions—the majority of foreigners who do that are not missionaries—and we are the first to request the recall of such men. We confidently rest the case of our foreign missionaries in Latin America upon the results of their work."

Two thoughts flashed across the mind of the writer as he considered the two important documents. In the first place, it seems to him that only those can properly understand the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church in Latin America who have carefully studied Luther's famous Smalcald Articles and Melancthon's equally famous Tract Concerning the Power and Primacy of the Pope. "... that the Pope is the very Antichrist." (*Triglot*, p. 475.) But in this crisis mere condemnation does not suffice. The spiritual distress of the neglected peoples in Roman Catholic Latin America is a challenge that we preach to them the precious Gospel of Christ, which Rome has always obscured and opposed. More Gospel preaching in South and Central America should be recognized as one of the many postwar problems by which our Church is faced. The Lutheran Hour has well paved the way for such work in Roman Catholic Latin America.

J. T. M.

The Pope's Five Points of Social Reconstruction.—In his Christmas Eve address Pope Pius XII submitted what has been called "Five Points of Social Reconstruction." In briefest summary they are the following:

1. To the human person must be given back the dignity given to it by God from the very beginning.
2. The intrinsic unity of society and the integrity of the family must be worked for.
3. Labor must be honored, a just wage is required, and the rights of private property must be recognized.

4. There must be a rehabilitation of the juridical order as against juridic utilitarianism and positivism. The courts must be of the right kind.

5. The State and its power must be made to serve society, which must be placed upon an ethical basis.

These are generalities; there is nothing new in them. We are submitting this summary to place into the hands of our readers a convenient list of the topics that are in the forefront in sociological debates.

A.

Concerning Infant Baptism.—Telling the story of Archibald Alexander, the first professor of Princeton Seminary, Dr. Clarence Edward Macartney writes an interesting paragraph on the professor's attitude to infant baptism, which we here reprint:

"During the time he was pastor at Briery and president of the college, Alexander, in common with a number of other ministers, fell into doubt respecting the authority of infant baptism. This led him to a careful and systematic study of the whole subject. The two considerations, he says, which kept him from joining the Baptists were, first of all, that the universal prevalence of infant baptism as early as the fourth or fifth century was unaccountable on the supposition that no such practice existed in apostolic times. The other consideration was that if the Baptists were right, all other denominations are out of the Church. As one instance of the universality of infant baptism as early as the beginning of the fifth century, he cites the correspondence between St. Augustine and Pelagius on the subject of original sin. Augustine told Pelagius that the denial of original sin would lead, logically, to the denial of infant baptism. But such a thing Pelagius rejected with horror, declaring that he had never heard of any heretic who denied the validity of infant baptism. If Pelagius could so write to St. Augustine, the inescapable inference was that infant baptism was no recent or novel practice in the Church, but went far back of the beginning of the fifth century."

A.

Brief Items.—In Abyssinia Protestants are again able to carry on mission work freely since the Italian domination has ceased. According to a report in the *Christian Union Herald* Protestant Christians remained loyal to their faith in spite of the difficulties placed in their path by Roman Catholic priests. The most prominent Protestant mission in that country is that of the United Presbyterians.

Whoever has to bestow some thought and study on eugenics may well read an article in the January 16 issue of *America* (R. C.), in which sterilization of criminals and certain unfortunates is strongly opposed. The writer quotes Dr. J. B. S. Hildene, the eminent professor of biology of the University of London, as saying: "I personally regard compulsory sterilization as a piece of crude Americanism like the complete prohibition of alcoholic beverages. But I look to the common sense of the American people to realize that here, as with prohibition, a mistake has been made."

It is reported in the press that in Rumania all church bodies except the established Church, which is the Greek Orthodox, have by a special

decree been declared dissolved. The church body which is affected most vitally are the Baptists, who have quite many adherents in Rumania. The plea is that national unity demands such a drastic measure. The skies look threatening for the cause of religious liberty.

Northwestern University at Evanston, Ill., received a gift of twenty million dollars, which is to be added to a previous gift of \$6,735,000 for the establishment of a technological institute. The donor is the late Walter Patton Murphy, who made this gift in his will. What tremendous sums people are willing to bestow on projects that have merely temporal significance!

In the International Missionary Council the place of Dr. Warnhuis has been taken by Dr. John W. Decker. His headquarters are in New York. His colleague in England, whose headquarters are in London, is Dr. William Paton. This International Missionary Council endeavors to represent, generally speaking, the Protestant churches of the world as far as they are engaged in foreign mission work. It is one of the agencies which the Federal Council is trying to unite in a new organization, for which the name North American Council of Churches has been proposed.

The Church of the Brethren, according to an announcement before us, is collecting \$500,000 for special Christian work in war time. All this is in addition to the regular work of the Church. Considering that the denomination has but 175,000 members, the effort is most remarkable.

The general, that is, the chief officer of the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits, died in Rome, December 13, 1942. His name is but little known. It was Vladimir Ledochowski. In 1915 he became the head of the order. After the war a meeting of 150 "fathers superior" assembling from all parts of the world will be held, and a successor will be chosen.

The Church press draws attention to the ruling of the Supreme Court according to which every State of the Union has to recognize divorces granted in Nevada as valid. In South Carolina a couple was prosecuted for bigamy because according to the laws of that State the divorces obtained in Reno which preceded the marriage were not legally justified. Technically the Supreme Court appears to be right because the Constitution provides that "full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of every other State." It seems that a change of law, that is, a constitutional amendment, is imperative.

Information from Great Britain is to the effect that the dispersion of London children to smaller towns and to villages and hamlets in England has brought to light that many of these children are totally ignorant of the very first principles of the Christian religion. Religious training in the schools of the country is strongly urged now. The situation can hardly be worse than it is in our own country.

Southern Baptists, so an exchange informs us, are objecting to the Victory Tax of the Government, asserting that the system which demands that a Church deduct 5 per cent from the salary of its pastor and other employees and hand that money to the Government as a

special tax is a "clear violation of the separation of the Church and State in the Bill of Rights." They protest against the plan that the Church act as the agent of the Government in this matter. Perhaps some judicial tribunal will be asked to render an opinion on the question of law involved.

At the recent Federal Council of Churches meeting in Cleveland a five-minute speech was heard that was different from the vast majority of speeches delivered there. The Rev. Carl McIntire of the Bible Presbyterian Church was the speaker. In his account of what he said occur these words: "I told them that we could not get along with their plan for a new social order, that we believed that the emphasis of God's Word and the remedy for the world was not a new social order, but a new man, and that this new man came only through the new birth as Jesus proclaimed it and a belief in the precious blood of the Son of God which could cleanse white as snow." We hope that God blessed this testimony.

Commenting on the exemption of theological students from the war draft the *Watchman-Examiner* says: "Theological students in our country are exempt from war service on the ground that the churches must be kept strong and active or else the morale of our people will go to pieces. . . . They are exempt also because they are preparing to serve as chaplains or else to take the places of pastors who become chaplains. Let it always be remembered that the theological student owes as much to his country as his brother who is bearing arms."

The views of the Archbishop of Canterbury on disestablishment of the Church have received prominent mention. We can now quote his very words, reported in the *Christian Century* of December 16, 1942, which show that, after all, he is not in favor of disestablishment. "We have our divine commission, let us set ourselves to fulfill it. If as a result, or for any other reason, the State wishes to separate itself from us, let it do so. As a citizen, I should on the whole regret it, because I think that the establishment carries with it certain values for the life of the State and the nation that could not be replaced. But it is a question for the State and for ourselves as citizens. It is not a question for the Church or for the members of the Church." He forgets that it is the duty of the Church to set forth what the Word of God has to say with respect to this point.

Churches here are being urged to meet the home defense challenge of larger juvenile delinquency. Thomas A. Meriweather, executive director of the Crime Prevention Association, has called the increase alarming. It is spreading like an epidemic, owing to warring conditions, among them absence of parents and inflated wages for youth. Judge N.S. Winnet is asking police captains to call together ministers of all faiths within their precincts for conference. The Philadelphia Council of Christian Education brought together workers from 33 churches at the Tioga Presbyterian Church to discuss needed and adequate action.

—Correspondence in the *Christian Century* from Philadelphia.

This statement of President Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago deserves to be pondered: "We need technology to win the war, but technology will not win it. And technology alone will not establish a just and lasting peace. What will win the war and establish a just and lasting peace are educated citizens. . . . I reject in the strongest terms Mr. McNutt's assertion that non-essential courses must be replaced by subjects of immediate utility in winning the war. The courses which will be of greatest value in winning the war are not those of immediate practical utility, but those which will teach you as citizens to think." This blast against utilitarianism in education is certainly much needed.

While German missionaries have been interned in India and South Africa, German missions continue to function in Japan and China, according to the *Religious News Service*. No information is available concerning the former German missions in the Netherlands East Indies. A number of missionaries from this area were on a ship which was sunk during the evacuation when the Japanese were advancing.—*Christian Century*.

At the Chicago Lutheran Seminary, located at Maywood, one of the suburbs of Chicago, recently new professors were inducted: Charles Foelsch as president of the Seminary, H. Grady Davis as professor of practical theology, E. Theodore Bachmann as assistant professor of church history, and J. Roy Strock as professor of English Bible and missions. The Seminary belongs to the U. L. C. A. When in his installation address Dr. Gould Wickey of Washington, D. C., stated that Lutherans will continue to be characterized by the words "only Christ, only faith, only grace, and only Scripture," which are to be applied "in a creative sense" (correspondence in the *Christian Century*), we wonder what the meaning is. Is there to be an evolution of doctrine?

According to the religious press a Methodist clergyman of prominence, John Heston Willey, known as the founder of the Lord's Day Alliance and president of it since 1930, died recently. He had attained the ripe age of 88 years.

A correspondence in the *Christian Century* reports, "All churches of British Columbia have joined in an appeal to the Government for a cut in hours of sale of liquor." Inasmuch as the churches consist of citizens, we suppose such an appeal cannot outrightly be condemned as involving a disregard of the Church's true function, that of preaching the Word of God. The Church as such has but one task, that of spreading the Word.

In South Carolina some Methodists have refused to join the large Methodist merger and are attempting to continue separately the Methodist Episcopal Church South. According to an exchange, a group of such people, using the name Methodist Episcopal Church South, when some property by deed was conveyed to them, was declared by a court not entitled to this property; but the same court decision stated that the merger has no exclusive right to the name Methodist Episcopal Church South.

An alarming news item states that 225,000 young men who were physically able for military service had to be sent back home because they had less than a fourth-grade education. The same item reports that "in the thirteen South States more than one million youths under twenty-five years of age have not had so much as one year's schooling and three million less than four years'." One would like to know to what extent discrimination against the colored people is responsible for such conditions. That in the mountain regions of the South, where on account of the poverty of the people the county and State appropriations for school purposes are necessarily low, many of the white boys and girls receive little, if any, schooling, is notorious.

In Detroit a man by the name of Weinzierl, who broadcasts frequently and advertises his church prominently in the religious pages of the press, is said to anoint handkerchiefs for the sick and to issue special invitations to the ailing and the afflicted. One service a week he has termed "the miracle meeting," when so-called divine healing is the chief attraction. Evidently he endeavors to imitate St. Paul. The true understanding of 1 Cor. 12-14 has evidently not yet dawned on him.

In the Congregational Unitarian Pilgrim Church of El Paso, Texas, three infants were "welcomed into the fellowship of all the good souls and dedicated to the service of righteousness and love," according to a report before us. To make matters still more horrible, the Jewish Rabbi of El Paso read the vows that were to be taken by the parents. What depths of indifference and unbelief one witnesses here!

A total of 2,549,919 students attended Catholic educational institutions in the U.S. last year, according to the *Religious News Service*. Of this number 18,969 attended seminaries, 143,279 colleges, 372,339 high schools, and the remainder parochial. — *Christian Century*.

A correspondent of the *Christian Century*, writing from Mexico City, Mex., remarks on the activities of an organization called Sinarquistas. He describes it as a "hand-raising, flag-waving Fascist" body, opposed to "pro-democratic" Catholics and Protestants. These people, when they speak of "national unity," have in mind, so the correspondent avers, "Roman Catholic uniformity," and Protestants are accused of being "traitors of the nation." Among the charges which they raise against Protestants is the assertion that "the Protestants pay people money to attend their services, and this accounts for their large congregations." The writer maintains that there is a strong campaign on foot having in view the "complete extirpation of freedom of worship in Mexico and other countries south of the Rio Grande." He states that many Protestants in the United States unwittingly play into the hands of the Sinarquistas.

The Augustana Book Concern, Rock Island, Ill., has published a book containing tributes to Gustave Albert Andreen, written by "associates, family, and friends." The price is \$1.00. Andreen played an important role in the history of the Augustana Synod. From 1901 to 1935, the year in which he retired, he was president of Augustana College and Theological Seminary. A.

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Strengthen Thy Brethren. Pointers from Peter for power in Christian living. A devotional exposition of the First Epistle of Peter. By Howard W. Ferrin, President Providence Bible Institute. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 190 pages, 5×8. Price, \$1.25.

Coming from an author who believes in the inerrancy of the Scriptures and who wishes to exalt our divine Savior, this book can be recommended to our pastors. It is written in a simple style, without any efforts at oratory, and endeavors to fix attention on the chief thoughts in the First Epistle of St. Peter. The book does not intend to be a commentary explaining all linguistic and other problems that arise as one peruses this Epistle either in the original or the English translation. The author's purpose is to furnish a work that is devotional and edifying. His method will become somewhat apparent from topics of various chapters which we cite: 1. Comforting Truth; 2. The Living Hope and Its Comforts; 3. Singing in the Fire; 4. So Great Salvation. Other writers to whom he refers us and whose works he himself drew on are Archbishop Leighton and Dr. F. B. Meyer. Quite often gems of spiritual poetry are included emphasizing the truths which are taught in the holy text.

In explaining the expression "elect according to the foreknowledge of God" (1:2) the author did not entirely apprehend the meaning of the Apostle, although with some of the things he says one has to be in full agreement. He writes, "We realize that this word 'elect' has confused many minds. It is certain to do so because we know little or nothing of the secret transactions of God in eternity. He alone knows the causes of His choice, but that does not mean that we can argue, as some have argued, that if they are not the elect of God, they cannot be saved. Contrariwise, we hold that one *knows* whether he is the 'elect' of God, for we read in John 6:37 the words of our Lord, 'All that the Father giveth Me shall come to Me'" (p. 13). The author should not have rejected as wrong the statement "If they are not the elect of God, they cannot be saved." Only God's elect attain salvation. When President Ferrin continues, "Have you come to Christ? Have you been attracted to Him and acknowledged Him as your Lord and Savior? If so, then you may assure your heart that you are one of the 'elect' of God and have been included within what F. B. Meyer has called 'that mystic circle'" (p. 13), he expresses a thought to which we heartily subscribe.

The expression "according to the foreknowledge of God" causes him some difficulty. He writes, "None can know the depth of meaning contained in these words, but we are of the opinion they mean that from all eternity God has known those who would accept the overtures of mercy. Shall we say that He foresaw there were to be children of faith

who would cleave to Christ and therefore prove themselves to be saints of the faith; and all these He foreknew and predestinated to be conformed to the image of His Son? What a wonderful thing it is to be known of God from eternity. In Ephesians, the first chapter, we read that we have been chosen in Christ 'before the foundation of the world.' Truly, we come upon depths of mystery which our finite minds can little understand." The humbleness of spirit manifested by the author and his willingness to believe in all simplicity the teachings of God are admirable, but his analysis of the term "foreknowledge of God" is not satisfactory. "Foreknowledge" according to the way in which the sacred writers use the term in speaking of God's election means more than a mere advance knowledge of what is coming in the future. It includes an act of God's will, a *nosse cum affectu et effectu*, as our Lutheran fathers correctly said. That such interpretation is in keeping with New Testament teaching is evident from the Ephesians passage to which the author himself refers.

With much interest we read what the author says on the celebrated passage 3:18-22. In dwelling on the preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison he correctly says (p.139), "We cannot hold that Christ in the interval between His crucifixion and resurrection went into another world and preached deliverance to either those righteous ones who were suffering in purgatory, waiting to be delivered at His coming, or Old Testament saints who were found faithful." He emphasizes properly that Peter does not say that Christ preached deliverance, but simply that He *preached*. His explanation is the one which was sponsored as long ago as the days of St. Augustine, which Church Father took the view that the Apostle is here referring to the preaching which Christ did as the *logos asarkos* through Noah before the Flood. While this interpretation asserts an important truth, we hold that it does not express what St. Peter here states, namely, the descent of Christ into hell to make known to the evil spirits that He had conquered. On the much discussed passage 1 Pet. 4:6 President Ferrin correctly observes that the preaching mentioned there refers to the preaching addressed to people while they were living but who now are dead. Generally speaking, we believe that our pastors and teachers will find much that is useful and beautiful in this work.

W. ARNDT

The Christian and the War. By Charles Clayton Morrison. Willett, Clark, and Company. 145 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.50.

Does the Bible Sanction War? (Why I am Not a Pacifist.) By Harold Snider. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. 158 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

Should a Christian Go to War? By William L. Pettingill, D. D. Fundamental Truth Publishers, Findlay, Ohio. 14 pages, paper cover. Price, 15 cents.

Dr. Morrison's book, a reproduction of editorials which appeared in *The Christian Century* in 1942 after the outbreak of the war with Japan and Germany, asks the Christian to take an impossible position on the question of war. Before the outbreak of a war the Christian must be a pacifist and condemn war as sin; in the midst of war, however, he

must give up that position. And the position of the "Christian militarist" ("By a Christian militarist is meant one who defends war as morally righteous and sanctioned by the will of God. The word 'militarist' is not used in the invidious sense of one who is a mere warmonger. The militarist we have in mind is a Christian, a thoughtful and devoted Christian whose convictions as to his duty are no less a matter of conscience than are the convictions of the conscientious objector as to war," p. 70) is at no time justifiable, neither before nor in war. In war the Christian must become a realist, one "who denies that the war can be adjudged righteous under any code of civilized or Christian morality" (p. 111) but knows that it is his duty to support the war; he must tell the pacifist: "Now that the war is here, you have no recourse save to accept its necessity and to fight in it, penitently, until it comes to an end in accordance with the inherent forces which constitute war." (P. 138.) The realist tells the Christian "militarist" that in wartime the distinction between a just and an unjust war must no longer be made. "The question of the ethics of self-defense in an *actual war situation* is irrelevant, academic, and meaningless." "In a war situation the canons of right and wrong which are the criteria of ethical behavior in peacetime do not apply." (Pp. 17, 118.) Dr. Morrison would classify Augustine as a Christian militarist ("Augustine drew a distinction between a 'just war' and an 'unjust war.' It is right, he said, for a Christian to engage in a 'just war,'" p. 71) who gave the Christians bad advice.—Dr. Morrison buttresses his position with arguments such as these: "In discussing the issue, we will not be misled by the fallacious analogies of war with the use of police force, or with force in general." (P. 11.) "Jesus left us no specific example for our conduct in a war situation. He did not live in a war situation. He lived in a prewar situation." (P. 139.)—With some sections of our book the Bible theologian will find himself in full agreement. "The Lord of history has called the nations before his judgment seat to receive his verdict: Guilty! One and all, Guilty! Japan, Guilty! Great Britain, Guilty! Germany, Guilty! America, Guilty! A thousand times, declares the Judge of all the earth, have I warned you that the kind of world you were making was contrary to my will. . . . My warnings you heard, and though you flinched under the sting of my rebukes, you would not heed them." . . . (P. 44.) "There is a wide area for moral activity for the Christian and the Christian community in wartime. There is the area of constructive and helpful service to those whom the war has injured or dislocated or exposed to hideous moral temptations. . . . A second open field for Christian action is that of the Church itself. The Christian Church is not at war. But tremendous pressures are being brought to bear to make it a party to the war. . . . A third field: Christian activity is required to guard against hysteria, to combat the hate campaigns, etc." (P. 128 f.)

The treatise *Does the Bible Sanction War?* is a curious mixture of truth and error. It takes issue with "the resolution adopted in 1941 by a certain pacifistic denomination: 'That again, true to our historic peace position, we affirm that war is sin, unconditionally and always,' a resolution "supported by Matt. 5:44 and 2 Cor. 10:4," (p. 55) and shows

that it does not agree with Scripture. It goes beyond and against Scripture, however, when it declares that "we would be justified in participating in a defensive war, when the life of the Christian Church is at stake." (P.117.) It offers no Scripture proof for the thesis that the Church may and should defend itself with the sword. The proof it offers—"I am set for the defense of the Gospel" (Phil.1:17)—is of a piece with the proof which the pacifists offer for their thesis: 2 Cor. 10:4. We note, too, that the author does not believe in his thesis when he, on page 7, agrees with the statement that "the sword is not to be used in the propagation and maintenance of the Gospel."—Our author is a millennialist and operates with the postponement theory. "God promises Israel a wonderful millennial kingdom. Isaiah's prophecy would have been fulfilled, *had the Jews accepted Him*. Had Israel bowed sincerely before the lowly Nazarene, their great Messianic kingdom would have become a reality, and world peace and righteousness would have reigned! But they refused Him! They nailed Him to the cross, and the kingdom and its characteristics had to be postponed." (P.100.) Exegesis of John 18:36: "My kingdom is not of this world (world system, or age). If the kingdom *had* been for this present order, *then* would His servants have fought! In just so many words Jesus said: 'If necessary, my servants would resort to armed force to establish the kingdom.'" (P.139 ff.)—The polemics against the pacifists is at times intemperate and extremely unjust. For instance, "All of this leads us to make a statement regarding pacifism which can scarcely be denied, namely: That *most* pacifists are what they are because of a mortal fear of physical conflict." (P.140.)

The little pamphlet *Should a Christian Go to War?* instructs the Christian that when the Government, in the performance of its duty, draws the sword, he must support it. "This word, 'He beareth not the sword in vain,' is God's warrant for the policeman's club or revolver, the soldier's bayonet or rifle, the army's big siege gun, etc." Dr. Morrison will not hear of "the fallacious analogies of war with the use of police force or with force in general." But we are certainly not committing a fallacy when we connect the idea of force with the "sword" of which St. Paul speaks, the force of the policeman and the force of the Army. And when our pamphlet calls attention to the instructions which John the Baptist gave the soldiers and asks: "There were Christian soldiers in the apostolic churches: why were they not commanded to leave the army? Why did not the Apostle Peter tell Cornelius the centurion to resign his commission?" men ought no longer to say: "Jesus left us no specific example for our conduct in a war situation. He lived in a prewar situation."

TH. ENGELDER

A Digest of Christian Thinking. By Charles S. Macfarland. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 192 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.50.

Current Religious Thought: a Digest. By Charles S. Macfarland. Fleming H. Revell Company, New York. 185 pages, 5¼×7½. Price, \$1.50.

These are the fourth and fifth volumes in Dr. Macfarland's series of a "reader's digest" in modern theological literature. Dr. Macfarland,

the secretary emeritus of the Federal Council of Churches, seems to be acquainted with all important current religious books. Of the hundreds of religious books that have appeared in 1940 and 1941 he has selected some ninety volumes for a brief review and evaluation. The selection of books is satisfactory from the viewpoint of liberal theology, and these digests give the reader a fairly complete view of modern trends in religious thought. Dr. Macfarland groups the various books under such headings as: Current Religious Philosophy and Ethics; The Church and the Kingdom; Revision of Christian Education; Christian Thinking in Great Britain; The New Order of Mankind; Re-Examinations of the Social Gospel. Naturally, it is very difficult to do justice to an author in a brief review or a sketchy synopsis. We can appreciate Dr. Macfarland's difficulty in reducing Brunner's *Man in Revolt*, a book of some 600 pages, to three short pages. Niebuhr's *Nature and Destiny of Man* receives seven pages, and Dr. Macfarland has succeeded fairly well to find his way through Niebuhr's "sometimes labyrinthian discursus." We have read a number of the volumes discussed by Macfarland and found that his analyses and synopses are quite satisfactory. Since it is impossible and indeed unnecessary (we are tempted to say unprofitable) to read all the books on current theology, digests such as prepared by Dr. Macfarland are extremely helpful, especially since Dr. Macfarland is personally acquainted with a large number of authors whose books he reviews, and he approaches his task with a sympathetic attitude toward the authors, with the possible exception of K. Barth. F. E. MAYER

Reality in Preaching. By Russell D. Snyder, Otto A. Piper, Oscar F. Blackwelder, and Fred C. Wiegman. The Muhlenberg Press. Philadelphia. Price, \$1.50.

Dean E. E. Flack of the Hamma Divinity School, who wrote the foreword for this volume, explains that it contains the addresses delivered on the "Kessler Lecture Foundation by a group of distinguished clergymen at an Institute on Preaching held in Hamma Divinity School of Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio."

Four theologians have contributed these lectures. Dr. Snyder is professor of practical theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary of Philadelphia. Dr. Piper is professor of theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. For many years he was a teacher of theology in German and English universities. He came to America in 1937, following his service as interpreter at the Oxford and Edinburgh Conferences. Dr. Blackwelder is pastor of the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C. Dr. Wiegman is president of Midland College and Western Theological Seminary, Fremont, Nebr.

Naturally, neither the content nor the manner of treatment of these lectures is of equal quality, but that does not detract from the value of the book, which is distinctly worth the attention of every preacher who still takes to heart the admonition of St. Paul "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that *thy* profiting may appear to all," 1 Tim. 4:15. True, there are even now many treatises on homiletics on the market. It is also true that no man becomes a good preacher by merely reading or studying homiletics, just as no man

becomes a good musician by reading essays on music, but preachers do need the instruction and stimulation which may be obtained by reading what successful leaders have said and written on this subject. Some go so far as to say that every preacher should read one new book on homiletics every year. We may not be willing to go as far as that; yet the very eagerness to improve will create a hunger for good homiletical advice. While we need not agree with everything taught on this subject, the very antagonism which is stirred by a controversial statement is helpful and stimulating. The preacher in his reading of such books is to follow the advice of Lord Bacon: "Read not to contradict and confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find talk and discourse, but to weigh and consider. Some books are to be tasted, others to be swallowed, and some few to be chewed and digested; that is, some books are to be read only in parts; others to be read but not curiously; and some few to be read wholly and with diligence and attention."

Dr. Snyder shows that he is at home in Lutheran principles, for he states that we Lutherans "see no saving power, no balm for a sinful and aching world, in the specious humanism that has supplanted the Word of God in many American pulpits." He regrets, however, that so few Lutheran ministers have published volumes of sermons, while almost every sectarian preacher of any prominence has published at least one such volume. He also emphasizes the importance for every pastor of the study of the Bible; no preacher can know the Bible too well. That certainly harks back to Luther and our old teachers.

Dr. Piper insists that many laymen are sick and tired of sermons which treat social, political, economical, or literary issues. They are crying out for doctrinal preaching. He writes, "That as witnesses we have to present Jesus Christ Himself as the inescapable fact in the life of the race; not the 'historical Jesus' of liberal theology only, but Him who was raised from the dead and is now among us as the living and triumphant Lord. There are His incarnation and His earthly ministry, His atoning death, His glorious resurrection, and the sure promise of His return. They are historical facts, undeniable and inescapable, and they alone are apt to satisfy the anxious longing of our contemporaries. These facts reach right into our lives because Jesus as the risen Lord makes us contemporaneous with Himself." He condemns "subjectivism" and calls for "objective" affirmations of faith. We must have preachers who speak with authority and not as the scribes and Pharisees. Dr. Piper's chapter on "History and Preaching" is also distinctly worth reading.

The most impressive essay in this book is that of Dr. Blackwelder, who points out that before a man can be a preacher he must be a person. He touches upon a very important point which has not been given sufficient attention, that is, the importance and value of the preacher himself in his mental, physical, and spiritual make-up. The Latin word *ingenium* expresses exactly what we mean, but it is very difficult to translate. The word *personality* comes close to being a translation of it, but still the connotations in the two words differ. This writer also touches upon a subject which is rarely treated, namely, the physical

stamina of the preacher. He does not deny that men with physical handicaps have done good work. Paul had his thorn in the flesh; Luther at times suffered intense physical pain and disability—but, oh, how they did work when they could work! However, few men have the “ingenia” which Luther and Paul had. Moreover, we remember that both Luther and Paul groaned because of their handicaps and wished intensely to be rid of them. Dr. Blackwelder also reiterates the prayer of St. Augustine: “Oh, fill me with Thy goodness, Lord, until my very heart o’erflow.”

Altogether, this book is distinctly worth while. I am convinced that the pastor who begins to read this volume will read some sections of it again and again.

M. S. SOMMER

A Living Church at Work. By a Committee of the United Danish Ev. Lutheran Church. Danish Lutheran Publishing House, Blair, Nebraska. 123 pages, $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$. Price, 50 cents.

This book was printed by resolution of the 1941 convention of the United Danish Ev. Lutheran Church, having been prepared by a committee on evangelization, elected in 1938. It is to serve as “a true expression of the faith, life, and practice of our Church. As directive material, it contains just what we would like to place in the hands of our Church members and others. It will make its contribution towards the promotion of spiritual life and Christian service in our congregations.” We have read the book with great interest. There are a few sentences that we would have expressed differently in order to avoid misunderstanding, and we do not believe that the slogan “Accept the Christian religion by uniting with the Church” and the salutation in the sermon “Dear Christian Friends,” must be prohibited or guarded against because there are hypocrites in the visible church of God. While the congregation at Corinth had many faults and shortcomings, yet Paul does not hesitate to address the congregation as the church of God which is at Corinth and speaks of the members as such as are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints. 1 Cor. 1:2. We recommend this report to our pastors as a thought-provoking and action-stimulating book.

TH. LAETSCH

When Christ Went to Calvary. Lenten sermons by Walter F. Troeger and Harry E. Olsen. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis. $5\frac{1}{2} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, 82 pp. \$1.00.

Two series of sermons for Lententide are presented in this volume. The Rev. Walter F. Troeger of Santa Monica, California, furnishes a sequence of sermons based on incidents and personalities in the Passion history. The sermon for Maundy Thursday concerns Holy Communion and takes Prov. 4:11-18 for a text. The Rev. Harry Olsen of Detroit discusses the general theme “Salvation,” on the basis of a variety of texts; he appends a sermon on the Resurrection. These sermons are in the best tradition of Synod’s preaching. They reveal a humble deference to the doctrine of Scripture and the Catechism. But they endeavor to be crisp and timely in application.

Sermon series, particularly for Lent, make possible a preaching treatment which may diverge from the standard. A verse, a word, can

become the propulsion for a sermon, since it stands in relation to the entire series. The doctrinal pattern of the individual address need not be as complete as in a standard parish sermon, at times, since background or application may be taken care of in further units of the series. These sermons, too, achieve their full value for the reader and student when taken as a whole.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

The Rainbow Over Calvary. By W.G. Polack. Augsburg Publishing House, Minneapolis, Minn. 82 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$1.00.

This book has appeared just in time for the present Lenten season. Dr. Polack has furnished meditations on the Seven Words of Christ on the cross. These meditations are brief, well written, and edifying. They furnish thought for sermons and are well adapted to be read in the home during Lent. The large type makes for easy reading. In accordance with its content the book has been given a purple binding.

J. H. C. FRITZ

Lutheran Annual 1943. Published by Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 208 pages. Price, 15 cents.

Amerikanischer Kalender fuer deutsche Lutheraner auf das Jahr 1943 nach der Geburt unsers Herrn Jesu Christi. Derselbe Umfang und Preis.

An additional reason for spreading these publications at the present time is given by the publishers in their announcement: "Never before in the history of our Church have our members been scattered throughout the length and breadth of the land—and beyond its borders—as they are today! 40,000 of our Church's youth are in the armed forces. Another 60,000 have been uprooted and scattered abroad in our country's vast program of industrial expansion. One out of every nine of our communicants has joined the great American migration! Keep them with the Church! Keep the Church with them! Give them the *Lutheran Annual*! The *Lutheran Annual* will give them the name and location of every church affiliated with us at home or abroad; the name and address of every pastor and teacher of the Synodical Conference in this and foreign lands; of special value at this time: the listings for Australia, New Zealand, New Guinea, etc.; names and addresses of officials, boards, and institutions of our Church; the Walther League Service Directory, giving names and addresses of Christian Service secretaries in cities of more than 2,000 population; addresses of Lutheran hospice homes, hospitals, information bureaus, etc.; a calendar, a table of Bible readings for every day of the year, valuable statistical information, and numerous articles on various phases of the Church's work. Make your goal: A *Lutheran Annual* for every Lutheran home."—CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY cannot do better than to subscribe to all of this!

THEO. HOYER

